

Paper: “The Compliance Model as an Instigation for Post-Financial Crisis Efficiency in Corporations”

Submitted: 26 June 2023

Accepted: 29 January 2024

Published: 31 January 2024

Corresponding Author: Magda Ositashvili

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n1p157

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Róbert Szúcs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Onder Ozkul
Development and Humanitarian Aid Worker, Turkey

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The "Catalyst" means and connotation match two different things and derive synergy from this embedment, I suggest the use of other notion verse to Catalyst"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

this part covers the expectation

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

there is no big grammatical wrong at the body of the text

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The compliance notion is cross-cut with the accountability and participation notions. These parts might be deepened more, how AI might be used to design trendy community feedback and compliant mechanism, the importance of the stakeholders' feedbacks and how this mechanism might be developed with the most trendy technological tools

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

it provides the expected coverage

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Compliance and Cohesion might be compared in the text also to provide deep understanding

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

adequate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

congrats for meticulous efforts

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is quite explanatory and succeeds introducing to the reader the main topics in the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract successfully introduces the topic and the main contents of the article. It is clear and concise.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Some typos and misspells exist and need to be addressed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

It is not clear whether the paper is a literature review, a qualitative analysis based on historical assessment or a position paper on the topic. Please clarify what is your methodological intent.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is easy to read with few misspells and typos.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion does a good job in summarising the content, however it is not so clear which are the main limitations and future opportunities in the topic.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References can be improved.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author(s)

First of all it has been a pleasure for me to take part to the review process of your intriguing manuscript. Concerning your paper, I think you did a good job reviewing theoretically the topic of Compliance Models as Catalysts for Post-Financial Crisis Efficiency in Corporations. However, It is not clear whether the paper is a literature review, a qualitative analysis based on historical assessment or a position paper on the topic. Thus, I suggest clarifying what is your main methodological intent, to make the reader immediately aware of what he is going to read.

Furthermore, I have noticed a few misspells and typos in your text that need to be addressed. At last, i suggest reinforcing the literature anchorage by citing the main relevant sources lacking into this literature.

Good luck as you keep on working with your manuscript.

Best regards

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and informative and accurately reflects the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is well-written. The aims/objectives are clearly outlined and a succinct summary of the the methods used, the findings and implications of the study are provided.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, there are some minor errors

For instance, 'corporative' should read 'corporate' (including in key words)
the citations both in the text and in the ref list are not in line with the journal's
recommendation (e.g. Marcus Alfred A., 2021) or (Galietti Francesco. 2005).

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

While the abstract highlights the approach (e.g. mixed-methods), this paper should
contain a section on Method. This is missing and although there is some reference in
the text, a paper deserves to have a section specifically dedicated to the methods
undertaken with justification for the chosen approaches.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The paper is well-written and the arguments are well-presented.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The discussion is delves into advantages/benefits, challenges/limitations/conflicts of
compliance-driven innovations and provides some interesting avenues for further
research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The paper makes reference to 9 relevant and relatively recent sources. I would suggest
to include a few more, particularly in the introduction where not even a single source
is cited.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This an interesting paper that deserves publication with some minor tweaking. More specifically,

- include some citations in the introduction
- include a section specifically on Methods, where you can highlight the approaches/techniques use as well as some justification for the chosen methods
- perhaps, having the following sections - Introduction, Literature Review, Methods, Discussion, Conclusion - would be more fitting for ESJ.

- increase the number of citations in the ref list from say 9 to 15
- for in-text citations and references, refer to the guidelines for authors.

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title "The Compliance Model as a Catalyst for Post-Financial Crisis Efficiency in Corporations" is clear and gives a general idea of the article's content. It accurately reflects the focus on the compliance model and its impact on corporate efficiency after financial crises. However, it could be more specific and provide additional information about the scope or context of the study.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract provides a clear and concise overview of the study. It introduces the compliance model, discusses its goals and strategies, and outlines the methodology used, including a mixed-methods approach with theoretical review. It also presents the main findings, highlighting the positive impact of the compliance model on post-financial crisis corporate efficiency. Overall, the abstract effectively summarizes the key aspects of the article. BUT... this can be found in the abstract: "First, it reviews the compliance model's theoretical and practical consequences. Next, a quantitative analysis compares pre- and post-compliance model performance metrics in a sample of firms. Finally, qualitative interviews with key stakeholders assess the model's impact." Where are the results of quantitative and qualitative research? I don't find them. What is the author's own, primary research result and what is the literature?

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Based on the provided text, there are no apparent grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. The writing appears to be clear and well-edited, demonstrating attention to detail in terms of grammar and spelling.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained with sufficient detail. The article mentions a mixed-methods approach involving theoretical and practical analysis. It describes the review of the compliance model. But, the paper is a simple theoretical overview.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The article presents the results of the study clearly and without errors. It indicates that the compliance model improves corporate governance, malfeasance, and efficiency. The findings are presented in a coherent manner, contributing to the overall clarity of the article. And the problems... the paper is a theoretical overview, one of hundreds, the practical usefulness is questionable. No real primary research, no real measurement, no quantifiable indicators, etc.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions and summary accurately reflect the content of the article.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The amount of literature used is limited. Not convincing for a theoretical review.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Theoretical explanation without real innovation and problem solving. The paper is very, very long, too long... The article is boring to read. The author repeats several times what has already been said. Please shorten the article. Maximum 8-10 pages. Less will be more...

It would definitely be necessary to conduct real primary studies and look for real solutions instead of monotonous repetition of models. That's all anybody does...
