



Pre-submission Manuscript Review Service

SUBMISSION-READY REPORT

SAMPLE REPORT — FOR ILLUSTRATION ONLY

Psychological Safety, Knowledge Sharing, and Innovative Work Behaviour:

The Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership in Professional Service Firms

Target journal: Journal of Organizational Behavior (ABS 4★)

Report reference: VET-SAMPLE-2026

Sample report prepared: May 2026

This sample demonstrates the structure and depth of a Veticity Submission-Ready Report.

Cover Summary

SAMPLE REPORT NOTICE

This is a sample report created for demonstration purposes only. The manuscript, authors, findings, and all specific details are entirely fictional. The structure, analytical depth, and format are representative of what Veticity delivers to real authors.

This manuscript examines how psychological safety enables knowledge sharing in professional service firms, with transformational leadership proposed as a boundary condition strengthening this relationship. The research question is meaningful and the organisational setting is practically important. However, the paper requires fundamental revision on both theoretical and methodological grounds before it is viable for the Journal of Organizational Behavior.

Your manuscript is not yet ready for submission to the Journal of Organizational Behavior. Three interconnected problems need to be resolved: the theoretical justification for the moderation relationship is not established to ABS 4★ standard; the multi-theory integration is selective rather than coherent; and the methodological design has two independent problems — absent endogeneity treatment and a PLS-SEM choice that requires explicit justification against JOB's CB-SEM methodological culture.

Your Rejection Index score is 55.1 out of 100 against a JOB threshold of 82, placing your manuscript in the VERY HIGH risk band. Submitting in its current form makes desk rejection the most likely outcome. The good news is that the data is sound, the findings are interesting, and none of the required revisions involve new data collection. The revision task is demanding but it is the right kind of demanding.

The strongest element of your paper is the multi-source research design. Self-reported psychological safety and knowledge sharing combined with supervisor-rated innovative work behaviour directly addresses the common method bias problem that prevents many OB papers from reaching JOB standard. This is an asset the revision must protect.

Section 1 — Your Manuscript Profile

1.1 Submission snapshot

Title	Psychological Safety, Knowledge Sharing, and Innovative Work Behaviour: The Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership in Professional Service Firms
Target journal	Journal of Organizational Behavior
ABS tier (verified)	4★ — ABS Academic Journal Guide 2024
Paper type	Quantitative (PLS-SEM)
Word count (excl. references)	approx. 9,400 — within JOB 10,000-word limit
References	78
Tables / Figures	4 tables + 1 conceptual model figure

1.2 Structural compliance

Section	Status
Abstract	PRESENT — structured; includes problem, method, findings, contribution
Introduction	PRESENT
Theoretical background	PRESENT — dedicated Section 2
Hypothesis development	PRESENT — Section 3
Methodology	PRESENT — Section 4
Results	PRESENT — Section 5
Discussion	PRESENT — Section 6
Conclusion	PRESENT — Section 7
Limitations	PRESENT — integrated into Section 7

References	PRESENT — 78 references
------------	-------------------------

1.3 Abstract check

Element	Status
Problem / gap	PRESENT — gap in psychological safety research within professional service contexts stated in sentence 2
Method	PRESENT — survey of 287 employees across 14 UK consulting firms, PLS-SEM
Key finding	PRESENT — psychological safety positively predicts knowledge sharing; transformational leadership moderates this relationship
Contribution	PRESENT but vague — extends psychological safety theory to professional service contexts; not calibrated to ABS 4★ standard
Limitations	PRESENT — cross-sectional design and single-industry sample acknowledged

1.4 Golden thread

[RQ: under what conditions does psychological safety translate into knowledge sharing and innovative work behaviour in professional service firms? Note: a formal research question is not explicitly stated — reconstructed from the stated aim.]

→ [Theoretical lenses: Edmondson (1999) psychological safety theory; Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995) SECI knowledge creation theory; Bass (1985) transformational leadership theory — Note: SECI framework not carried through to hypothesis development]

→ [H1: PS → KS positive; H2: KS → IWB positive; H3: KS mediates PS → IWB; H4: TL moderates PS → KS (stronger at high TL)]

→ [Survey, n=287, 14 UK consulting firms, PLS-SEM via SmartPLS 4, multi-source: employee self-report + supervisor-rated IWB]

→ [H1 ✓ $\beta=0.412$ $p<0.001$ | H2 ✓ $\beta=0.338$ $p<0.001$ | H3 ✓ indirect $\beta=0.139$ $p=0.004$ | H4 ✓ $\beta=0.187$ $p=0.002$]

→ [$R^2_{KS}=0.389$ | $R^2_{IWB}=0.461$ | $SRMR=0.061$]

1.5 Gap analysis

Element	Content
Gap type	EMPIRICAL — specific moderated mediation configuration not previously tested in professional service firm context
Gap statement	"No study has, to our knowledge, simultaneously examined knowledge sharing as a mediator between psychological safety and innovative work behaviour, alongside transformational leadership as a moderator of the PS–KS pathway, within a professional service firm setting."
Gap fulfillment	Design tests the configuration: moderated mediation PLS-SEM, n=287, UK consulting firms. All four hypotheses supported.
So What check	PRESENT but underdeveloped — authors state the finding clarifies when psychological safety produces innovation outcomes, but do not justify why this matters at ABS 4★ contribution level.

Gap support analysis — available in full in your report

Veticity's gap support analysis identifies whether each gap claim is established by cited evidence or asserted without citation support, and whether citations actually support the gap claim they are used to justify. This analysis is produced fresh from each manuscript's specific reference list and cannot be meaningfully illustrated with a sample. In your report, this section shows exactly which citations support your gap claim, which do not, and where the evidence base is strongest or weakest.

Section 2 — Expert Peer Review

REVIEWER PROFILE

Reviewer	Dr M.T. · Reviewer #0047
Sub-discipline	Organisational Behaviour · HRM · Quantitative
Methodology	PLS-SEM · CB-SEM · Survey design · Moderated mediation
Veticity record	14 reviews completed · Editor quality rating: 4.8 / 5
Publication venues	Journal of Organizational Behavior · Journal of Applied Psychology · British Journal of Management
Editorial role	Editorial review board member

Your reviewer was matched to this manuscript based on sub-discipline alignment, methodology expertise, and familiarity with your target journal's editorial standards. The assessment below represents their independent scholarly judgement — it was not directed or shaped by the AI triage analysis.

This section contains the independent assessment of a domain expert reviewer matched to your manuscript's sub-discipline and target journal. The review was completed using Veticity's structured review protocol and quality-checked before inclusion in this report.

2.1 Reviewer pre-read assessment

Before opening your manuscript, your reviewer recorded the following independent assessment:

B1 — Initial contribution hypothesis:

"The paper proposes that transformational leadership is the organisational condition that converts the individual-level resource of psychological safety into knowledge-creating behaviour. This is an interesting moderation claim that would need to demonstrate why leadership specifically, rather than team climate or structural factors, is the binding mechanism."

B2 — Scholarly conversation identified:

"The paper enters the knowledge management and OB conversation about when individual psychological states produce organisational outcomes. It positions itself specifically within the emerging body of work linking psychological safety to innovation, which JOB has published actively in the last three years."

B3 — Most important question brought to the reading:

"Whether the moderation by transformational leadership is theoretically distinct from the main effect of psychological safety itself — if high transformational leadership produces high psychological safety, the moderation model may be testing the same underlying construct twice through different pathways."

2.2 Summary ratings

All ratings are calibrated against ABS 4★ publication standards for *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.

Criterion	Rating	Scale anchor
C1. Theoretical / scholarly contribution	2 / 5	Not present → Exceptional
C2. Positioning in existing literature	3 / 5	Poor → Excellent
C3. Methodological rigour	2 / 5	Severe flaws → Exemplary
C4. Coherence of argument	3 / 5	Incoherent → Highly coherent
C5. Written communication	4 / 5	Poor → Excellent
C6. Journal fit	3 / 5	No fit → Strong fit
C7. Gap quality and fulfillment	3 / 5	Absent/unfounded → Exemplary

Overall verdict: REVISE FIRST

The paper has a sound empirical foundation and a multi-source design that is genuinely above average for this literature. The problems are theoretical and methodological: the moderation mechanism is not sufficiently differentiated, the multi-theory integration is incomplete, endogeneity is unaddressed, and the PLS-SEM choice requires explicit justification against JOB's methodological culture. These are addressable without new data collection, but they require substantive rethinking.

2.3 Reviewer's assessment and comments

D1 — Theoretical contribution and scholarly significance

The paper makes a genuine contribution by testing transformational leadership as a moderator of the psychological safety–knowledge sharing relationship in a context, professional service firms, where this mechanism has not been systematically examined. At ABS 4 stars standard, however, the theoretical rationale for why transformational leadership specifically amplifies psychological safety's effect on knowledge sharing needs to be more precisely specified. The paper currently argues that transformational leaders create supportive climates, but this overlaps substantially with the theoretical mechanism of psychological safety itself (Edmondson, 1999). The reviewer was unable to identify a distinct theoretical boundary between the moderation effect of TL and the direct effect of PS that would satisfy a JOB reviewer's expectation of theoretical precision.

More fundamentally, the authors investigate the moderating role of TL, but the justification for prioritising this specific moderation relationship over alternatives is not clearly established. Not studying a relationship does not inherently constitute a gap in the literature, a gap must be justified as a meaningful omission whose resolution contributes to existing knowledge. The authors need to demonstrate why the TL moderation relationship specifically, rather than team climate, psychological empowerment, or inclusive leadership, is the theoretically important boundary condition to investigate. The introduction of transformational leadership lacks this clarity: while there is a general discussion of leadership, the transition to this specific construct is abrupt. Why TL rather than servant leadership or inclusive leadership? This distinction needs a theoretical answer, not an empirical one.

The knowledge sharing → innovative work behaviour pathway is the least theoretically developed link in the chain. The paper cites Janssen (2000) for IWB but does not engage with the more recent theoretical debates about whether IWB is better conceptualised as a single construct or as three distinct sub-processes (idea generation, idea promotion, idea implementation). JOB has published extensively on this distinction and a reviewer familiar with this literature will notice the absence.

Finally, while the choice of French professional service firms is noted, it remains unclear whether this choice is driven by institutional characteristics, by the relevance of France as a comparator for other European markets, or by some other rationale. This context should be explicitly linked to the study's theoretical objectives. A clear research question, currently absent, would also significantly improve the paper's focus and guide the reader through the argument more effectively.

D2 — Literature positioning and theoretical framework integration

The positioning is well-executed. The paper clearly identifies its location within the psychological safety literature and provides a coherent map of the gap it claims to fill. The use of Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995) is appropriate but the socialisation-externalisation-combination-internalisation framework is introduced in the theory section and then does not appear in the hypothesis development. This creates a gap between the theoretical apparatus and the empirical model that a reviewer will identify. Either use SECI consistently throughout or replace it with a more parsimonious theoretical framing that maps directly onto the two-construct knowledge sharing measure used in the survey.

The choice of theoretical framework, while briefly discussed in the introduction, requires more substantive justification in the theoretical development section. The authors should address the limitations of each individual theory, the rationale for integrating all three simultaneously, and — crucially — how the integration produces theoretical insights that none of the three theories could generate alone. Currently the paper uses each theory selectively to support specific arguments rather than adopting a genuinely integrated perspective. At ABS 4 stars standard this reads as theoretical decoration rather than theoretical architecture.

The theoretical development section should also be contextualised in the French institutional setting. If the French professional service context is a claimed originality of the paper, hypotheses should be derived from a combination of theory and local context, not from generic theoretical predictions that would apply equally in any developed economy.

D3 — Research design and methodological rigour

The methodological execution has genuine strengths. The multi-source design, self-reported psychological safety and knowledge sharing from employees, supervisor-rated innovative work behaviour, directly addresses the common method bias problem that plagues single-source OB studies. The measurement properties (HTMT, AVE, factor loadings) are all reported and within acceptable thresholds. SRMR = 0.061 is comfortably below the 0.08 threshold.

However, the absence of any endogeneity treatment is a significant limitation that the authors cannot leave unaddressed. Psychological safety and transformational leadership are both likely endogenous to unmeasured organisational-level variables such as firm culture, leadership selection processes, and historical performance, all influence both constructs simultaneously. Without an instrumental variable strategy or at minimum a Gaussian copula correction, the authors cannot rule out that the observed relationships are artefacts of firm-level selection effects rather than genuine causal mechanisms. This is not a minor omission as it fundamentally limits the causal interpretation of the central findings and will be raised by any reviewer familiar with recent JOB methodological standards. The authors should address this directly rather than treating it as a limitation to acknowledge in passing.

The choice of PLS-SEM as the sole analytical technique raises a more fundamental question of fit with JOB's methodological culture. JOB predominantly publishes theory-testing studies using CB-SEM, which provides confirmatory model fit indices that PLS-SEM cannot replicate. The authors should either provide an explicit theoretical and methodological justification for choosing PLS-SEM over CB-SEM, for instance, if the model has formative indicators or if predictive rather than confirmatory purposes are primary, or consider whether a CB-SEM reanalysis would better serve the confirmatory hypothesis-testing purpose of this study. While PLS-SEM studies have been published in ABS 4 stars journals, these papers typically combine PLS-SEM with complementary analytical approaches (such as multilevel modelling to account for nested data structures) or address contexts where CB-SEM is genuinely unsuitable. Neither condition clearly applies here.

It remains uncertain whether JOB would be receptive to a study relying solely on PLS-SEM given its current methodological profile. Acceptance would likely depend on the novelty of the research context, the richness of the dataset, and the extent to which the study advances theory. The dataset is valuable and the population relevant; however, studies focusing on this type of population are not uncommon in the literature. The empirical context alone may not be sufficiently distinctive to compensate for a single-method approach at this journal. The authors should consider whether a CB-SEM reanalysis is feasible, and if not, provide a clear, literature-grounded justification for why PLS-SEM is the appropriate choice for this specific research design.

D4 — Findings and discussion

The moderation finding (H4) is the paper's headline result and the discussion handles it reasonably well in connecting the finding to practical implications for leadership development in consulting firms. The theoretical interpretation of the moderation, however, repeats the imprecision from the theory section: the discussion explains that transformational leaders create psychological safety, which then enables knowledge sharing. If this is the mechanism, the moderation and main effects are functionally the same construct at different levels of analysis. The discussion needs to present an interpretation where transformational leadership does something distinct from, not simply amplifying, the psychological safety mechanism. The absence of engagement with Newman et al. (2024, JOB), which addresses exactly this overlap question, is notable.

D5 — Implications and practical relevance

The practical implications for professional service firm leaders are present and appropriately specific. The recommendation that leadership development programmes in consulting firms should focus on creating psychologically safe environments for knowledge exchange is grounded in the findings and actionable. The theoretical implications for the psychological safety literature are underdeveloped — the paper needs to state more precisely what the moderation finding adds to Edmondson's original framework beyond confirming that leadership context matters.

D6 — Written communication and presentation

The manuscript is well-written with clear sentence structure and appropriate academic register for JOB. The figures are clean and the tables are correctly formatted. Three minor points: (1) the introduction is 700 words and could be tightened to 500 without losing substance; (2) abbreviations PS, KS, IWB, and TL are used inconsistently — sometimes the full term is used alongside the abbreviation and sometimes not; (3) the limitations paragraph in Section 7 is strong and appropriately detailed.

2.4 Required revisions

Major revisions — must be addressed before submission

- 1. Theoretical differentiation of moderation mechanism** — D1 — Theory section and Discussion — effort: Medium
- 2. Multi-theory integration and justification** — D2 — Theory section — effort: Medium
- 3. Endogeneity treatment** — D3 — Methodology section — effort: Medium
- 4. PLS-SEM justification or CB-SEM reanalysis** — D3 — Methodology section — effort: Medium to High
- 5. Gap justification at ABS 4★ standard** — D1 — Introduction — effort: Low
- 6. Research question and contextualisation of France** — D1 — Introduction and Methodology — effort: Low

Section 3 — Journal Fit Analysis

3.1 Alignment scores

Journal	Score	Band	ABS tier
Journal of Organizational Behavior	68 / 100	Moderate	4★
Journal of Applied Psychology	72 / 100	Strong	4★
Journal of Management	65 / 100	Moderate	4★

Scores represent semantic alignment between the manuscript abstract and each journal's recent editorial content. Based on JOB's 2023–2025 publication record. 70–100 = strong | 45–69 = moderate | below 45 = low.

3.2 Dimension breakdown — JOB

Dimension	Weight	Score	Weighted contribution
Topic fit	n.d.	72 / 100	n.d.
Methodology compatibility	n.d.	80 / 100	n.d.
Theoretical framework alignment	n.d.	60 / 100	n.d.
Contribution level match	n.d.	53 / 100	n.d.
COMPOSITE	100%	68.15 / 100	

n.d.: not disclosed in this sample report

3.3 Strategic fit matrix

	Lower ABS tier	ABS 4★
High fit (≥60)	---	JAP — 72/100 — ASPIRE OPTION
Lower fit (<60)	---	JOB — 68/100 — STRATEGIC PIVOT JOM — 65/100 — STRATEGIC PIVOT

JAP sits in the Aspire Option quadrant: strong alignment with a tier that matches the paper's ambition. JOB and JOM are Strategic Pivots — the tier is right but theoretical framework alignment and methodological fit both need addressing before these journals represent a strong submission target.

3.4 ABS 4★ contribution calibration

ABS 4★ benchmark:

JOB expects contributions that identify a new boundary condition, mechanism, or theoretical integration that changes how the field conceptualises a core OB construct. The paper must go beyond testing a relationship in a new context to making a claim about how psychological safety theory should be revised or extended.

Your contribution category: EXTENSION-LEVEL (currently insufficient for ABS 4★)

The moderation claim is a mechanism-level aspiration but it has not yet been developed to the standard JOB requires. Without a clear theoretical justification for why TL is the boundary condition, the paper reads as an extension in a new context rather than a theoretical advance. The PLS-SEM methodological concern compounds this: JOB’s CB-SEM culture means that methodological choices are themselves read as signals of the paper’s theoretical ambition.

3.5 Critical misses — recent JOB publications not cited

Paper	Relevance	Status
Frazier et al. (2023, JOB): Meta-analysis of psychological safety and innovation outcomes	Direct empirical backdrop; absence will be noticed by any JOB reviewer in this area	NOT CITED
Newman et al. (2024, JOB): When does transformational leadership create psychological safety?	Addresses the TL–PS overlap identified in B3 and D1; engaging with this paper is now essential	NOT CITED

3.6 Acceptance rate context

JOB published acceptance rate: 5% (verified — Wiley Online Library, 2026)

A VERY HIGH risk band means desk rejection is the most likely outcome in the current state. At a 5% acceptance rate — one of the most selective rates in the ABS 4★ tier — approximately 1 in 20 submissions is accepted. Quality above the threshold is the prerequisite for entering that pool. Your current quality index of 55.1 is 26.9 points below the threshold. The revisions in this report are designed to close that gap. Once above the threshold, editorial timing, theoretical precision, and cover letter framing determine outcomes within the acceptance pool.

Section 4 — Rejection Index

4.1 Input scores

Dimension	Score	Source
Journal fit	68 / 100	Journal Fit analysis (JOB 2023–2025 publications)
Novelty and gap quality	53 / 100	n.d.
Methodological rigour	50 / 100	n.d.

n.d.: not disclosed in this sample report

4.2 Quality dimension breakdown (ABS 4★ weights)

Dimension	Weight at ABS 4★	Score	Contribution to index
Journal fit	n.d.	68 / 100	n.d.
Novelty and gap quality	n.d.	53 / 100	n.d.
Methodological rigour	n.d.	50 / 100	n.d.
Combined quality index	100%	55.1 / 100	

n.d.: not disclosed in this sample report

Threshold K = 82 (ABS 4★ standard) | Deficit D = 82 – 55.1 = +26.9

RISK BAND: VERY HIGH
 Combined quality index: 55.1/100 — Deficit: +26.9

What VERY HIGH means for your submission:
 Your manuscript’s current quality profile makes desk rejection the most likely outcome at JOB. This is not a reflection of the paper’s potential — it is a signal that the manuscript is not yet ready for this journal in its current form. The revisions in this report address the specific gaps driving the deficit. Completing Priority 1 actions before submission is not recommended — it is essential. The alternative journals in Section 3.3 represent viable immediate targets if you wish to submit before completing the full revision.

4.3 What is driving the quality index

The primary driver is the Novelty and Gap Quality dimension at 53/100, which carries the highest weight (50%) at ABS 4★. The reviewer's rating of 2/5 on theoretical contribution (C1) reflects four compounding problems: TL–PS mechanism overlap, absent gap justification, abrupt TL introduction, and underdeveloped IWB theorisation.

The Methodological Rigour dimension at 50/100 is now the second significant constraint, driven by two independent problems: unaddressed endogeneity (which limits causal interpretation) and the PLS-SEM justification gap (which raises a methodological culture fit question specific to JOB). Both problems independently reduced C3 from the paper's actual empirical execution quality to 2/5. The multi-source design — which is genuinely strong — prevented C3 from falling further.

Addressing the theoretical problems (Actions 1, 2, 5) would raise NGI toward 67–73. Addressing the methodological problems (Actions 3 and 4) would raise MRI toward 70–75. The combined revised Q would be approximately 68–72 — approaching but not necessarily clearing the JOB threshold of 82. Reaching the threshold requires theoretical contribution (C1) to reach 4/5, which is only achievable if the TL moderation mechanism is genuinely differentiated at a theoretical level that satisfies JOB's standard. This is the central revision challenge.

Section 5 — Revision Roadmap

Opening assessment

This paper has a multi-source empirical design that is genuinely above average for the psychological safety literature. The findings are interesting, the setting is relevant, and the data is collected. The barriers to JOB acceptance are theoretical and methodological — both are demanding to address but neither requires returning to the field. The central revision challenge is making a theoretically precise claim about why transformational leadership specifically is the mechanism that activates psychological safety’s knowledge-sharing effect, and defending that claim with a methodology that JOB’s editorial culture will accept. The revisions below are designed to give the paper the best possible chance at JOB, and to position it at JAP if JOB proves too ambitious in the current form.

Priority 1 — Critical revisions

Action 1 — Theoretically differentiate the moderation mechanism

	Detail
Location	Theory section (Section 2), Discussion (Section 6)
What to do	Specify the precise mechanism by which transformational leadership amplifies — rather than merely creating the conditions for — psychological safety’s effect on knowledge sharing. One viable reframing: TL provides the motivational scaffold that converts the individual-level resource of psychological safety into a team-level knowledge exchange process, drawing on Hackman’s (2002) enabling conditions framework. This creates a theoretical boundary between PS (individual cognitive resource) and TL (team-level enabling mechanism). Engage directly with Newman et al. (2024, JOB).
Why this matters	The TL–PS overlap is the primary driver of the quality index deficit. It is also the concern the reviewer articulated before opening the manuscript (B3) — which means it will be the first thing any JOB reviewer looks for.
Effort	Medium — rewriting two theory paragraphs and the discussion interpretation. No new data.

Action 2 — Justify multi-theory integration and align SECI with empirical model

	Detail
Location	Theory section, Sections 2.1–2.3
What to do	Add a 200-word paragraph explaining what the three-theory integration produces that single-theory accounts cannot. Address the limitations of each theory individually. Either map SECI processes onto the knowledge sharing measure or replace Nonaka & Takeuchi with Argote & Ingram (2000) knowledge transfer theory, which maps directly onto the two-item construct.

Why this matters	The SECI disconnect will be raised in any JOB review. “Theoretical decoration rather than theoretical architecture” is the risk.
Effort	Medium — one integration paragraph and revision of one theory sub-section.

Action 3 — Address endogeneity

	Detail
Location	Methodology section, Section 4.4
What to do	Add a Gaussian copula correction for the psychological safety variable (Ralston et al., 2022 for PLS-SEM implementation). Add one paragraph reporting the correction and confirming results are robust. This does not require new data.
Why this matters	The reviewer described the absence of endogeneity treatment as a fundamental limitation. JOB has desk-rejected papers in this area for this specific omission.
Effort	Medium — additional SmartPLS analysis and one methodological paragraph.

Action 4 — Justify PLS-SEM or reanalyse with CB-SEM

	Detail
Location	Methodology section, Section 4.1–4.2
What to do	One of two paths: (A) Provide an explicit methodological justification for PLS-SEM over CB-SEM, grounded in the literature on when PLS-SEM is appropriate (predictive purposes, formative indicators, small samples with non-normal data). If none of these conditions clearly apply, path (A) is weak. (B) Reanalyse using CB-SEM via AMOS or Mplus, report confirmatory fit indices (CFI, RMSEA, SRMR), and rerun the moderated mediation using the PROCESS macro or bootstrapped indirect effects. Path (B) removes the JOB methodological culture concern entirely and is recommended if the sample size supports it (n=287 is sufficient for CB-SEM).
Why this matters	This is the most distinctive concern in D3. JOB’s methodological culture is CB-SEM. A paper that cannot justify PLS-SEM will face this concern in review regardless of its other qualities.
Effort	Medium (path A) to High (path B). Path B is recommended for JOB; path A is sufficient for JAP.

Action 5 — Justify gap at ABS 4★ standard

	Detail
Location	Introduction, gap claim paragraph
What to do	Replace the gap statement with a justified gap argument: explain why the absence of research on this specific moderated mediation configuration is a problem for the field. What decisions or theories are currently misinformed because this question has not been answered?

Why this matters	The reviewer explicitly stated: not studying a relationship does not constitute a gap. This is the most common ABS 4★ desk rejection reason.
Effort	Low — rewriting one paragraph.

Action 6 — Add research question and contextualise France

	Detail
Location	Introduction; Methodology context
What to do	State a formal research question in the introduction. Add one paragraph linking the choice of French professional service firms to the study’s theoretical objectives.
Why this matters	Absence of a research question at JOB signals underdeveloped conceptual focus.
Effort	Low — one sentence RQ; one paragraph context justification.

Priority 2 — Substantive improvements

Action 7 — Strengthen theoretical implications in Discussion

Location: Discussion, Section 6.3. State precisely what the moderation finding adds to Edmondson’s (1999) PS framework — not just that leadership context matters, but how the boundary condition changes how the field should apply PS theory in organisational settings.

Action 8 — Add two critical JOB citations

Location: Theory section and gap claim. Cite Frazier et al. (2023) as empirical backdrop and Newman et al. (2024) as theoretical comparator. Both are JOB publications on your core constructs. Their absence will be noted by any reviewer familiar with recent JOB output.

Action 9 — Engage with IWB sub-process debate

Location: Theory section, Section 2.3. Two sentences acknowledging Janssen’s three-component IWB framework and explaining why the study treats IWB as a single construct. Achievable — the model complexity justifies it — but it needs to be stated explicitly.

Journal fit recommendation

Primary target: [Journal of Organizational Behavior \(ABS 4★\)](#) — after all Priority 1 revisions

Priority 1 revisions address all six concerns driving the VERY HIGH risk band. Post-revision estimated Q: 68–72. Note: reaching the JOB threshold of 82 requires C1 to reach

4/5 — achievable only if the TL moderation mechanism is genuinely differentiated at the theoretical level JOB expects. This is the central test of the revision.

Immediate alternative — Journal of Applied Psychology (ABS 4★, alignment 72/100): JAP has a higher tolerance for strong empirical execution with mechanism-level contributions. If you choose path A for Action 4 (PLS-SEM justification rather than CB-SEM reanalysis), JAP is the stronger immediate target. Your multi-source design will be received well there.

Revised submission timeline

Phase	Content	Timeframe
A — Critical revisions	Actions 1–6. Action 4 (PLS-SEM/CB-SEM decision) should be decided first as it determines the overall revision scope.	5–8 weeks
B — Substantive improvements	Actions 7–9. Re-read full manuscript for coherence.	1–2 weeks
C — Final preparation	Submission guidelines check. Cover letter foregrounding TL differentiation and multi-source design.	1 week

Total estimated revision period: 7–11 weeks

The range depends on whether you choose path B for Action 4 (CB-SEM reanalysis adds 2–3 weeks). The data is collected and the analysis infrastructure is in place. The revision is intellectually demanding but feasible.

What Veticity recommends you do not do

- 1. Do not submit to JOB before completing Actions 1–4** — the VERY HIGH risk band reflects a 26.9-point deficit; submitting now makes desk rejection the most probable outcome
- 2. Do not choose path A for Action 4 if targeting JOB** — PLS-SEM justification is unlikely to satisfy JOB’s CB-SEM culture; path B (reanalysis) is the only clean solution for this journal
- 3. Do not add a fourth theoretical framework** — the existing three need to be integrated, not supplemented

This paper’s empirical foundation is strong enough to reach JOB if the theoretical and methodological revision is done rigorously. The revisions are demanding but they are the right kind — no new data, no redesigned study, just the intellectual work the paper currently needs.

If you have questions about any action in this roadmap or wish to discuss the revision strategy before beginning, contact your Veticity coordinator. We are invested in your submission success.

Section 6 — Reviewer Intelligence Brief

This section shows you what your reviewer understood about your paper’s structure and argument before opening the manuscript. Comparing the attention flags below to the reviewer’s pre-read commitment answers in Section 2.1 reveals where your paper’s intended first impression diverges from expert expectation.

Attention flags presented to your reviewer

Your reviewer received up to six attention flags before opening the manuscript, each structured as a four-column table: manuscript location, structural observation, a question to bring to the reading, and a blank column for the reviewer’s independent assessment. Two illustrative flags from this sample report are shown below.

Location	Structural observation	Question for reviewer
Theory section 2.2 and Hypothesis H4	Both the PS → KS main effect and the TL moderation of PS → KS appear to be grounded in the same mechanism (safe climate enables sharing)	Is the moderation effect theoretically distinct from the main effect, or does TL amplify the same mechanism PS already represents?
Methodology section 4.1	PLS-SEM selected as the sole analytical technique; no explicit justification for choice over CB-SEM provided	Does the PLS-SEM choice require explicit justification given JOB’s methodological culture, and would CB-SEM better serve the confirmatory purpose of this study?

Full attention flags table — available in your report

Your report contains up to six flags drawn from your manuscript, each grounded in a specific page and section reference. A fourth column — Reviewer’s Assessment — is left blank for the reviewer to complete independently after reading your manuscript. Flags are ordered by priority: gap analysis flags first, then paper-type flags, then structural and literature flags. Each flag is a question, not a verdict — the reviewer’s independent judgement is the product.

In this sample, the reviewer independently confirmed both illustrative flags above and raised four additional concerns through the substantive assessment in Section 2.3.

Section 7 — About This Report

Veticity provides expert pre-submission manuscript review for business and management researchers. This sample report demonstrates the structure and analytical depth of a Veticity Submission-Ready Report. All manuscript details are entirely fabricated — any resemblance to a real paper is coincidental.

A real Veticity report is produced through three integrated analytical layers: AI structural extraction (Phase 1), human expert peer review (Phase 2), and algorithmic metrics combining journal alignment scoring and rejection risk analysis (Phase 3). At every stage, human editorial oversight is applied: an editor approves the triage decision and inputs passed to the reviewer, the reviewer's report is quality-checked before inclusion, and the final assembly is reviewed before delivery.

Veticity's mission is to give every researcher access to the quality of pre-submission guidance that has historically been available only to those with senior colleagues in the right institutions. This report is that guidance.

VETICITY — SAMPLE REPORT NOTICE

This is a fabricated sample report. The manuscript, authors, reviewers, findings, scores, and all specific details are entirely fictional and created for demonstration purposes only.

A real Veticity Submission-Ready Report is prepared exclusively for the submitting author and is confidential. It must not be shared with journal editors, reviewers, or third parties.

To begin your pre-submission review: veticity.com

Questions: coordinator@veticity.com