

Paper: “Inventory for Critical Managerial Soft Skills (ICMS) – Development and Standardisation”

Submitted: 16 August 2022

Accepted: 17 October 2022

Published: 31 October 2022

Corresponding Author: Chandra Vadhana Radhakrishnan

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p72](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n31p72)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Lovergine Saverio
INAPP, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy

Reviewer 2: Nirmal Kumar Betchoo
Université des Mascareignes, Mauritius

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Lovergine Saverio	
University/Country: INAPP, University of Rome "Tor Vergata", Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/09/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/09/2022
Manuscript Title: INVENTORY FOR CRITICAL MANAGERIAL SOFT SKILLS (ICMS) - DEVELOPMENT AND STANDARDISATION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0903/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3

<i>The title is adequate, but I would like/prefer a “more attractive”/“more appealing” title.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Well done, but there are too many keywords.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the current debate in the literature the topic of soft skills and their measurement is very important.

For example, also university is today called to adapt to the demands of a complex and mutable labour market, where it is important to support the graduates' employability and to prepare future professionals who possess, in addition to technical skills, also soft skills.

I believe that, according to international literature (Bennett et al., 1999; Heckman & Kautz, 2016), a model of soft skills has to be set up in different areas to tackle the path university efficiently (for example: area of task (problem solving and decision making, adoption of strategies adequate in tackling the task, etc.); area of the self (self-enhancement, emotional self-regulation, etc.); motivational area (goal orientation, resilience, etc.); area of the interpersonal relationship (teamwork, conflict management, etc.).

In any case, I like this paper, and it is accepted (no revision needed).

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr Nirmal Kumar BETCHOO	
University/Country: Université des Mascareignes, MAURITIUS	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/08/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: : 19/08/2022
Manuscript Title: INVENTORY FOR CRITICAL MANAGERIAL SOFT SKILLS (ICMS) - DEVELOPMENT AND STANDARDISATION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0903/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Strengths of the paper:

- Good overall grammar used.
- Well structure arguments.
- Suitable and appropriate literature used.
- Quite consistent results achieved.
- Good referencing evidenced.

Some weaknesses of the paper

Formatting should be improved.
 Calculations are simplistic.
 Some deeper statistical insight might help.
 A few spelling errors exist.
 The context of the research must be known.
 Where is the study taking place?

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Fair but the research identifies more elements within soft skills communication.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Abstract for publication must be in a single paragraph, not a structured one.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Avoid capital letters. Remove full stops from subheadings. Please re-check. Examples: Page 3 heading-full stop, Page 5: Objectives-each in a separate line, Page 5 Metods: grounded theory-remove capital, check also paragraph indent in a uniform way	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Yes, but where was the study conducted? India or USA?	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> No issue regarding the consistency of results and they are elaborate.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Accurate conclusions that support the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Good references mostly from reputed journals.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Quite a good paper with the level expected from scholars of Stanford and Cochin, India. The paper is still descriptive using a mixed-method approach. It is a bit lengthy. Papers might need up to 7000 words with a limitation paragraph of some 5 lines. Please make the needed adjustments.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Fair paper. Well-grounded in Soft skills. Paper accepted after some changes as suggested are made.