



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Mindfulness in Management: Applying Buddhist Principles to Improve Organizational Leadership – A Literature Review
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This manuscript presents a conceptual link between Buddhist philosophy and modern organizational leadership. The author attempts to merge ancient wisdom with contemporary managerial frameworks. While the premise holds immense value for continuous quality improvement and academic quality assurance, the execution lacks the necessary rigor for publication in an international journal. The current draft resembles a loose collection of thoughts rather than a structured academic treatise. A complete overhaul is requisite. The manuscript requires a data driven approach to validate the conceptual claims.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The title suggests a literature review focused on organizational leadership. However, the actual text drifts into operational details like agricultural waste and retail administration. The author must align the title with the actual content. A more accurate title would reflect the broad exploration of Buddhist doctrines in general commerce.
The abstract lacks a clear statement of the research gap. The author states that Buddhist doctrines provide useful guidance, but fails to detail the specific mechanisms of this guidance.



The abstract needs an explicit summary of the exact literature analyzed. Furthermore, the author must state the precise theoretical contribution of the study.

The introduction jumps abruptly between unrelated concepts. The author introduces recent pandemic impacts without sufficient context. The transition from general administration to the pandemic and then to environmental sustainability is abrupt. The author needs to build a logical argument progression. The citation format is inconsistent. The author must integrate these disparate ideas into a cohesive narrative about continuous quality improvement in modern firms.

The stated problem is convoluted. The author asks rhetorical questions about organizational resource deployment amid lockdowns. A formal research manuscript should state a definitive problem, not pose rhetorical questions. The transition to specific sutras is sudden and lacks theoretical foundation. The author must clearly define the exact gap in current managerial literature.

The objectives are excessively broad. The author seeks to explain key doctrines, examine applications, analyze roles, and explore relevance. These goals overlap significantly. The author should consolidate these into two precise, actionable objectives. Clear objectives will provide a roadmap for the entire manuscript.

Methodology

This section is fatally flawed. The author describes the work as library research. In contemporary academia, a literature review demands a systematic approach. The author must detail the exact search terms, databases utilized, inclusion criteria, and exclusion criteria. Without a data driven methodology, the review lacks validity. The author must adopt an outcomes based framework to evaluate the literature.

Body Sections

The manuscript devolves into definitions of basic administrative concepts like strategic formulation and managerial oversight. Journal readers already comprehend these basic concepts. The author should delete textbook definitions and focus entirely on the intersection of Buddhist philosophy and these managerial functions. The section on robes is completely disconnected from organizational leadership. The author must synthesize the literature rather than merely summarize it.

Tables and Bibliometric Data

Table 1 compares a manager to a leader via outdated clichés. Table 2 and Table 3 present journal metrics and citation counts, but the text fails to integrate this data into the main argument. The author lists journals but does not explain how this bibliometric data advances the research problem. The author must analyze this data to show trends in the field.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The recommendations are superficial. The author suggests soundproof meditation rooms without sufficient evidence of their efficacy. The conclusion introduces new ideas about animal welfare which were absent in the main text. The author must ensure the conclusion strictly summarizes the prior arguments.

References

The reference list contains severe format errors. The author lists the same sources multiple times in different formats. The inclusion of naked uniform resource locators at the end of the document is unacceptable. The author must apply a consistent citation style throughout the entire document.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript has an interesting intention to connect Buddhist teachings with organizational management, and I believe this direction can have scholarly value. However, my major concern is the conceptual validity of the link being established between Buddhist teachings and modern management concepts. In many sections, the manuscript appears to assume that a Buddhist teaching is already a management theory simply because some similarity can be observed. This is a serious conceptual problem because similarity of language or principle does not automatically establish theoretical equivalence. For the paper to make a credible contribution, the author needs to explain carefully how Buddhist concepts are translated, interpreted, and theoretically connected with present management constructs.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript repeatedly makes direct equivalence between Buddhist passages and modern management functions without sufficiently demonstrating the intellectual basis of such equivalence. For example, a passage from the Bodhi Kathā is interpreted as evidence of the management function of planning, while Nirvāna is subsequently presented in relation to the modern organizational concept of vision. These are strong interpretive claims. The author must establish why these teachings should be understood as planning or organizational vision rather than only appearing similar when interpreted through contemporary management language. Otherwise, there is a danger of imposing present-day management concepts on ancient religious texts.
The same conceptual problem occurs when the Buddhist order is presented as an example of organizational structure and resource management and when the Buddha's teachings and personal qualities are connected with contemporary leadership. I suggest the author develop an explicit analytical framework explaining the criteria used to decide that a particular Buddhist teaching corresponds with planning, organizing, leadership, motivation, control, human resource management, or another management construct. Without such criteria, the selection and interpretation of Buddhist passages may become highly subjective.
There is also insufficient distinction between Buddhist philosophy, Buddhist ethics, Buddhist monastic administration, Buddhist economics, and mindfulness. These are related but not interchangeable concepts. The title particularly emphasizes mindfulness, yet the manuscript actually discusses a much wider range of Buddhist doctrines and practices, including monastic resource use, wealth allocation, ethical trading, employer responsibilities, and several teachings from the Nikāyas. For example, the discussion of the Sigālovāda Sutta is interpreted in terms of present-day HRM responsibilities, including work assignment, salary, health support, special treatment, and leave. The author should clarify what exactly is the central



theoretical construct being investigated. At present, Buddhism itself appears to become a very broad umbrella under which almost every management practice can be placed.

The interpretations of canonical material also require stronger textual justification. The manuscript provides several Pāli expressions and immediately assigns managerial meanings to them, but the reader is not shown how these translations were established, which authoritative translation was followed, or whether alternative interpretations exist. This is especially important because the entire argument depends upon the meaning attributed to these ancient texts. The paper discusses managerial qualities from the Anguttara Nikāya, for example, and directly translates these into competencies of a businessman. A management journal may not require a full Buddhist textual exegesis, but some transparent interpretive procedure is necessary before these passages can support management theory.

More critically, the manuscript should avoid presenting analogy as evidence. The section on wealth management, for instance, associates Buddhist guidance on consumption, investment, emergency reserves, suitable associations, and personal development with contemporary wealth and social-capital concepts. This can be useful as a conceptual comparison, but the paper presently moves from resemblance to applicability too quickly. The author should distinguish clearly among three different claims: that Buddhist teachings are analogous to management principles, that they can inform contemporary management practice, and that they can actually improve organizational outcomes. These claims require different levels of evidence.

I therefore suggest that the manuscript be reconstructed around a defensible conceptual mapping framework. The author may identify selected Buddhist constructs, define their original meaning and context, identify corresponding management constructs from established organizational theory, and then justify the relationship between them using explicit criteria. Areas where the correspondence is only partial should also be acknowledged rather than forcing a direct equivalence. Doing this will make the manuscript much stronger because the contribution will no longer depend only on the observation that Buddhist teachings sound similar to modern management principles.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.



SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			