

**Review Form 3**

Book Name:	<a href="#">Science and Technology: Developments and Applications</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4918
Title of the Manuscript:	RESEARCH PARADIGM: A LITERATURE REVIEW
	Book Chapter

**Special note:**

A research paper already published in a journal can be published as a Book Chapter in an expanded form with proper copyright approval.

**Source Article:**

This chapter is an extended version of the article published by the same author(s) in the following journal.

Journal of Research in Business and Management, 11(2): 161-165, 2023.

Available: <https://www.questjournals.org/jrbm/v11-i2.html>

**PART 1: Comments**

<a href="#">Review Form 3</a>	<b>Reviewer's comment</b> <b>Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of research paradigms commonly employed in social sciences, including positivistic, interpretive, critical, and postmodernist perspectives, which are foundational to understanding diverse approaches to knowledge generation. By synthesizing seminal works such as Burrell and Morgan (1979) and Chua (1986), it bridges classical sociological theories with contemporary research practices, offering a valuable resource for novice researchers and seasoned scholars alike. Its emphasis on the philosophical underpinnings—ontology, epistemology, and methodology—enhances the scientific community's ability to critically evaluate and select appropriate paradigms for their studies. Furthermore, the manuscript's exploration of multi-paradigmatic approaches encourages interdisciplinary dialogue, fostering richer and more nuanced research frameworks.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title "RESEARCH PARADIGM: A LITERATURE REVIEW" is partially suitable but lacks specificity and appeal. While it indicates the subject matter (research paradigms) and the method (literature review), it is overly broad and does not convey the depth or focus of the manuscript, such as its coverage of specific paradigms or its theoretical grounding. An alternative title could be: <b>"Exploring Research Paradigms in Social Science: A Literature Review of Positivist, Interpretive, Critical, and Postmodern Perspectives"</b> . This revision provides a clearer scope and highlights the key paradigms discussed, making it more informative and engaging.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract offers a basic summary of the manuscript's intent and mentions the paradigms covered (positivistic, interpretive, critical, and postmodernist), along with key references (Burrell & Morgan, Chua). However, it is not fully comprehensive as it omits critical details, such as the manuscript's emphasis on ontological, epistemological, and methodological distinctions, which are central to the discussion. Additionally, the abstract ends abruptly with incomplete keywords, detracting from its professionalism. I suggest adding a sentence to highlight the philosophical dimensions (e.g., "These paradigms are analyzed through their ontological, epistemological, and methodological lenses") and completing the keywords section (e.g., "Keywords—Sociological Paradigms, Organizational Analysis, Radical Change, Ontology, Epistemology"). Deletion of the vague phrase "several paradigms have different perspectives on seeing reality" in favor of a more precise statement would enhance clarity.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is largely scientifically correct in its presentation of research paradigms, drawing on established theories and frameworks from Burrell and Morgan (1979), Chua (1986), and others. The descriptions of the positivistic, interpretive, critical, and postmodernist paradigms align with their philosophical foundations as documented in the literature. However, there are minor inaccuracies and oversimplifications. For instance, the claim that interpretivists believe "there is nothing real" (under the Interpretive Paradigm section) oversimplifies nominalism and could be rephrased as "social reality is constructed through subjective meanings rather than existing independently." Additionally, the manuscript occasionally lacks depth in methodological examples (e.g., specific qualitative or quantitative techniques), which could strengthen its scientific rigor. Overall, the content is sound but would benefit from tighter definitions and illustrative examples.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =	The references are sufficient in covering foundational works (e.g., Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Chua, 1986; Guba, 1990) and provide a solid theoretical base. However, the manuscript relies heavily on older sources, with many citations predating 2010, which limits its engagement with recent developments in paradigm debates. For instance, the postmodernism section could benefit from citing Lyotard's <i>The Postmodern Condition</i> (1984) as a seminal work or more recent critiques like Best and Kellner (1997) <i>Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations</i> . Additionally, incorporating contemporary discussions, such as Denzin and Lincoln's <i>The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research</i> (5th ed., 2017), would update the interpretive and critical paradigm sections. Including 3–5 recent sources (post-2015) would enhance the manuscript's relevance and currency.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality is inconsistent and, at times, unsuitable for scholarly communication. While the manuscript conveys complex ideas, it suffers from grammatical errors (e.g., "Radical Development in Accounting Thaought" in the bibliography), awkward phrasing (e.g., "nothing is real" under Interpretive	

Review Form 3

	Paradigm), and incomplete sentences (e.g., the abstract’s keywords). These issues undermine its readability and professionalism. Additionally, the use of repetitive terms (e.g., "reality" appears excessively without variation) and lack of concise expression suggest a need for thorough editing. A revision for clarity, grammatical accuracy, and academic tone—potentially with professional proofreading—would elevate the manuscript to a scholarly standard.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript is a promising contribution to the literature on research paradigms, particularly for its synthesis of diverse perspectives. However, it would benefit from a clearer structure, such as subheadings that explicitly delineate ontology, epistemology, and methodology for each paradigm, to improve readability and coherence. The "Closing" section repeats points from the introduction and lacks a strong conclusion; I recommend reframing it as a "Conclusion" that reflects on the implications of multi-paradigmatic approaches rather than restating earlier content. Finally, the absence of an image (despite a reference to one under the Research Paradigm section) should be addressed—either include it or remove the mention.</p> <p>The manuscript has a promising framework and valuable content but requires significant improvements in language, depth, and presentation to meet scholarly standards. With these revisions, it could become a strong contribution to the literature on research paradigms.</p>	

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewers:  
Prem Taba, Rajiv Gandhi University, India