



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “The Impact of Digital Leadership on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Study in Bursa”

Submitted: 06 April 2026

Accepted: 24 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Veli Kustepe

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n16p43

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Brian Sloboda
University of Maryland, USA

Reviewer 2: Paul Lipowski
Holy Family University, USA

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Paul M Lipowski, EdD	
University, Country: Holy Family University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/April/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 6/May/2026
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Digital Leadership on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Research in Bursa	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---17.---54.04.2026---	
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.	5
The title “ <i>The Impact of Digital Leadership on Corporate Social Responsibility: A Research in Bursa</i> ” is clear, specific, and accurately reflects the content of the study. It identifies: The key variables (digital leadership and CSR); The nature of the study (impact/relationship); The context (Bursa). This level of precision makes the article easy to categorize and relevant for academic indexing. No revision is needed.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
The abstract includes: Objective: Examining the relationship between digital leadership and CSR; Methods: Survey (332 participants), use of validated scales, SPSS, regression analysis; Results: Positive and statistically significant relationship. However, it could be improved by: Including more specific quantitative findings (e.g., correlation coefficient); Slight reduction of repetitive conceptual phrasing. Overall, strong but could be more concise and data-driven.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are noticeable grammatical and formatting issues, including: Repetition (e.g., definition of digital leadership in the introduction); Minor spelling/formatting inconsistencies (e.g., “programme,” spacing, punctuation); Table formatting errors and corrupted symbols (e.g., “ffi,” “YY.fi”); Inconsistent decimal notation (comma vs. period). These do not make the article unreadable but reduce professionalism and clarity. A thorough language edit is recommended.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The methodology is generally well explained: Sample size (n=332) clearly stated; Scales identified and referenced; Statistical tools (SPSS, regression, correlation, non-parametric tests) described; Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) reported. Some limitations: Convenience sampling is acknowledged but not deeply justified; The single-company sample limits generalizability; Some methodological explanations could be more concise. Overall, clear and appropriate for the study design.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are: Statistically sound (correlation, regression, reliability tests); Clearly linked to hypotheses; Supported by tables and quantitative outputs. Strengths: Strong reporting of R ² (0.468) and correlation (r=0.684); Logical progression from descriptive to inferential statistics. Some potential weaknesses: Some table formatting issues reduce readability; Minor inconsistencies in notation (e.g., commas vs. decimals). Despite those, there are no major analytical errors detected.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions: Accurately reflect the findings; Avoid overgeneralization; Emphasize practical implications (digital leadership as a strategic tool); Align with statistical results. They are well-structured and appropriately cautious given the study limitations.	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.
Strengths: Includes relevant foundational and recent sources; Covers both digital leadership and CSR literature Some concerns: Inclusion of irrelevant sources (e.g., books unrelated to CSR/digital leadership like <i>Shadow Warriors</i>); Formatting inconsistencies. The reference list needs curation and standardization.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This study provides a valuable contribution to understanding the relationship between digital leadership and corporate social responsibility, particularly within a localized context. The statistical analysis is solid, and the findings are meaningful for both academic and practical applications. To strengthen the manuscript, the following revisions are recommended:

1. Language and Formatting
 - Conduct a full proofreading to correct grammar, repetition, and formatting errors
 - Clean up corrupted table elements and improve readability
2. Abstract Enhancement
 - Include key statistical values (e.g., correlation coefficient)
 - Reduce repetition and improve conciseness
3. Methodological Clarity
 - Provide stronger justification for convenience sampling
 - Expand on limitations regarding generalizability
4. Reference
 - Remove irrelevant sources
 - Verify citations
 - Standardize formatting according to journal guidelines
5. Tables and Data Presentation
 - Reformat tables for clarity and consistency
 - Ensure all statistical notation is standardized

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: