

# TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT Review Form

Manuscript:			
Manuscript No:		Date sent:	
Reviewer:		Date due:	

RECOMMENDATIONS	PRIORITY
<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Publish immediately
<input type="checkbox"/> Accept with minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Give high priority
<input type="checkbox"/> Reconsider after major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> No rush
<input type="checkbox"/> Reject	

Confidential remarks to the editor (use additional pages if necessary):

Reviewer signature: .....

## REVIEW FORM

**Manuscript No:**

**Title:**

**Reviewer:**

**1 = Excellent**

**5 = Poor**

A. Is this article based on rigorous research?

Yes, based on rigorous academic standards	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

B. Is the article presented in a format which is accessible by practitioners?

Yes, focuses on justification, results and implementation; readable style; technical material in appendix	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

C. Clarity of presentation

Well organised, clearly written	1	2	3	4	5
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

D. Does the article make a significant contribution to the body of knowledge about quality management?

Highly significant, breaks new ground, provides a foundation for future research	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

E. Is the topic of interest to the field of quality management?

Topic is of interest to the field of quality management, relevant, timely	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

F. Is the rationale for the article well grounded?

Based on a known theory or on an interesting issue	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

G. Is the methodology appropriate and applied properly?

Analytical method is appropriate for the study and applied properly	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

H. If this article is a survey, is there evidence of reliability and validity of the constructs?

Strong evidence of reliability and validity provided	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

I. Discussion of the results:

Discussion is based on analysis of data; results aren't overstated or overgeneralized	1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---	---

J. What is your recommendation?

1	2	3	4	5
Accept, as is	Accept with minor revisions	Promising, but needs major revision	Doubtful; needs major revision for me to tell	Clear reject

K. Comments for the author: