International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management
ISSN: 3108-1754 (Online)
Volume 02 Issue 10 October-2026 | Impact Factor: 3.5



Portfolio-Review Communication and Follow-Up in Wealth Management: A Documentary OJT Case Study

Sakshi Patil, Divya Pawar

Dr. Shirly Abraham (Mentor, Associate Professor – Finance) and **Prof. Aishwarya Pawar** (Mentor)

MBA (Finance), School of Business, Indira University, Pune, Maharashtra, India

How to Cite this Article:

Patil, S., Pawar, D. & Pawar, A. (2026). Portfolio-Review Communication and Follow-Up in Wealth Management: A Documentary OJT Case Study. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, 02(10), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i10.212

License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.





https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i10.212

Abstract—

This descriptive qualitative case study examines the trainee-facing communication and follow-up workflow associated with portfolio-review outreach at a wealth-management organisation in Pune. The documentary evidence available for this manuscript is an earlier 12-page research-paper draft reporting on on-the-job training (OJT); the underlying original OJT report and activity records were not supplied for independent inspection. Both student authors report having undertaken OJT at the organisation, although their individual tasks and exact dates remain to be confirmed. A transparent thematic reading of the available manuscript identifies reported difficulties in reaching prospects, obtaining complete information, explaining financial concepts and coordinating follow-up. A source-to-claim table separates these secondary descriptions from interpretation. The practical contribution is a proposed control framework linking each reported difficulty to an authorised action owner and a prospective evaluation measure. No individual case, process improvement, supervisor endorsement or client outcome has been verified. The findings are consequently preliminary, document-bound and not generalisable.

Keywords— Wealth Management, Outreach, Client Communication, Follow-Up, Documentary Analysis, OJT, Qualitative Case Study.

The article is based on a documentary analysis of an earlier OJT-based manuscript, while published literature is used to provide conceptual support.

I. INTRODUCTION

Portfolio-review outreach involves more than communicating an invitation: it also requires a clear account of the service, an appropriate record of interest and a responsible handover when questions exceed a trainee's authority. The available case narrative reports these coordination tasks but does not establish that the trainees performed client-level suitability assessments or investment analysis. The present paper therefore studies communication and coordination, not portfolio performance.

A. Problem Statement

The central problem is how the reported outreach workflow can be described without overstating the evidence and how plausible documentation and handover controls can be specified for future evaluation.

B. Research Questions

RQ1. What outreach and follow-up stages are described in the available case narrative?

RQ2. Which communication and documentation difficulties are reported?



RQ3. What responses are described, and which are only proposed?

RQ4. What feasible, testable process safeguards follow from the documented difficulties?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Client Understanding and Financial Communication

Adil, Singh and Ansari (2022) examine financial literacy and behavioural biases in investment decisions [1]. Their investor survey does not directly measure service-outreach conversations, but it cautions against assuming uniform financial understanding. In this case, that insight is used as an interpretive rationale for plain-language explanations—not as proof that any particular prospect misunderstood a message.

B. Trust and Appropriate Role Boundaries

Adil et al. (2023) investigate trust in financial institutions and investment intentions among Indian investors [2]. The findings concern investor intentions, not OJT follow-up effectiveness. Here they motivate a proposed practice of accurately describing the service and referring advice-related questions to authorised personnel; no effect on trust is claimed.

C. Follow-Up, Documentation and Information Quality

The available narrative identifies incomplete information and follow-up management as challenges. A process-control interpretation is that recording permitted next steps, an owner and a due date may reduce ambiguity. This is an operational proposal derived from the case narrative, not a result demonstrated by an external empirical study or by this OJT.

D. Documentary Case-Study Method

Bowen (2009) describes document analysis as a qualitative method and highlights the importance of evaluating documents as evidence [3]. This paper applies a deliberately modest documentary approach: the accessible manuscript is treated as a secondary account of OJT, and assertions are not upgraded into verified incident-level findings.

E. Research Gap and Contribution

The contribution is not a claim that client communication has been neglected in scholarship. Instead, the case translates four reported coordination difficulties into a traceable set of proposed controls, roles and possible audit measures while showing how to distinguish a trainee account, its interpretation and a future intervention. The value is a replicable reporting structure rather than demonstrated performance gains.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. Case Setting and Participants

The case concerns Investsphere Wealth Pvt Ltd, Baner, Pune. Both Sakshi Patil and Divya Pawar have confirmed that they completed OJT at the organisation. The existing manuscript states a training period of 24 June–31 August 2026 and describes a Management Trainee role. The individual start/end dates, whether the placements fully overlapped, and division of workplace duties have not been documented in materials supplied for this revision and require confirmation before submission.

B. Documents and Provenance

The sole case document accessible for this revision is “Portfolio-Review Communication and Follow-Up in Wealth Management: An OJT-Based Case Study,” an undated 12-page earlier manuscript attributed to Sakshi Patil and Divya Pawar. It refers to an OJT report, but that original report, its author/date and its complete contents were not provided. Accordingly, this study analyses the earlier manuscript’s Abstract; Sections 4.1–4.6, 5–7 and 8–10, particularly its descriptions of activities, challenges, workflow and limitations. It cannot claim direct examination of the underlying OJT report. No diaries, weekly reports, outreach logs, approved communication examples or industry-supervisor feedback were supplied.

C. Passage Selection and Theme Construction

For this revision, passages were included if they explicitly described (a) outreach or service explanation, (b) interest/meeting coordination or follow-up, (c) incomplete information or client understanding, or (d) role limits and confidentiality. Passages about fund returns, NAV data and scheme comparisons were excluded as outside scope. Similar statements were grouped into four descriptive themes: prospect contact, information completeness, technical



explanation and follow-up coordination. Each finding below is traceable to a section of the earlier manuscript. These are editorial thematic categories, not independently coded field data.

D. Review, Checks and Reproducibility

The current revision was prepared from the accessible manuscript and checked against its section-level statements; no independent second-author coding, reconciliation meeting, industry-supervisor review or member-checking is evidenced. The authors must confirm who conducted the original OJT report analysis, whether both authors reviewed these themes and how any differences were resolved. A future reproducible audit would retain a versioned source file, an extraction sheet with page/section locations, a coding log and signed author review, subject to permission.

E. Ethics and Evidentiary Status

No client names, contact details, portfolio holdings, confidential communication or verbatim private records are included. The source descriptions are paraphrased rather than represented as quotations from a missing diary. Company authorisation for naming the host organisation and use of workplace material should be confirmed. No supervisor validation or client-outcome verification is asserted.

IV. CASE WORKFLOW AND EVIDENCE MAPPING

TABLE I. TRAINEE-FACING WORKFLOW RECONSTRUCTED FROM THE EARLIER MANUSCRIPT (REPORTED VERSUS PROPOSED STAGES)

Stage	Description	Evidentiary status
Outreach	Contacting prospective clients	Reported in earlier manuscript
Service explanation	Explaining purpose of portfolio-review invitation	Reported in earlier manuscript
Recording interest	Noting whether a prospect wishes to proceed	Implied by checking interest; exact recording practice unverified
Meeting coordination	Arranging potential meetings with senior personnel	Reported in earlier manuscript
Follow-up	Subsequent contact/activity tracking	Reported in earlier manuscript; records unavailable
Supervisor referral	Directing advice/suitability questions to authorised staff	Recommended safeguard; individual referral cases unverified

Note. Source: Authors' compilation from the earlier manuscript.

Portfolio assessment, investor risk profiling, risk–return analysis and investment actions are not presented as trainee-performed stages because the accessible document does not substantiate them.

TABLE II. EVIDENCE-TO-FINDING MATRIX (PARAPHRASED OBSERVATIONS; NOT ORIGINAL OJT QUOTATIONS)

Theme	Supporting observation in available manuscript	Source location	Interpretation	Limitation
Difficulty reaching prospects	Earlier manuscript lists difficulty reaching prospects among challenges.	Earlier manuscript §6.2	Contact initiation may require clear status categories.	No contact attempts, denominator or frequencies.
Incomplete information	Earlier manuscript identifies incomplete information as a challenge.	Earlier manuscript §6.2	Missing permitted details may complicate handover.	No example of a missing field or resulting delay.
Explaining concepts	Earlier manuscript reports varying financial understanding and need for simpler explanations.	Earlier manuscript §§6.2, 7.1	Standard approved plain-language wording may help consistency.	No recordings or comprehension checks.
Follow-up management	Earlier manuscript describes follow-up and activity tracking, and identifies management as a challenge.	Earlier manuscript §§6.1–6.2, 7.1	An owner and next-action date may make responsibility explicit.	No tracker or completion/timeliness data.

Note. Source: Authors' analysis of the earlier manuscript.



V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. RQ1: Reported Workflow

The accessible manuscript describes outreach, explanation of the service, meeting coordination and follow-up. It also refers to activity tracking. This supports a descriptive workflow map, not a claim that either author performed every step or that the process was implemented identically for every prospect. The precise allocation of tasks between the two student authors is unresolved.

B. RQ2: Reported Difficulties

Four challenges appear in the earlier manuscript: difficulty reaching prospects, incomplete information, differing financial understanding and follow-up management. The case narrative does not establish their prevalence, severity or causal relationships. The evidence matrix therefore identifies each as a reported challenge, with an explicit limit.

C. RQ3: Reported Responses versus Proposals

The earlier manuscript refers broadly to structured communication, tracking, checklists and escalation as approaches. It does not show whether a particular checklist was used, a referral occurred or an issue was resolved. The specific controls below should therefore be treated as new proposals. Financial-literacy and trust studies help explain why understandable, accurate communication is reasonable, but cannot independently verify workplace practices [1], [2].

D. RQ4: Proposed Process Controls and Evaluation

TABLE III. RECOMMENDATIONS LINKED TO REPORTED DIFFICULTIES; ALL EFFECTS ARE PROSPECTIVE AND UNTESTED

Reported problem	Proposed action	Responsible role (proposed)	Possible evaluation measure
Prospects difficult to reach	Use approved outcome codes and contact-attempt rules.	Outreach trainee; supervisor approves protocol	Share of attempts with a complete authorised status code
Incomplete information	Use a minimum-data checklist restricted to permitted fields.	Trainee records; supervisor reviews	Proportion of eligible handovers with required fields complete
Technical concepts difficult to explain	Use approved plain-language service script and referral trigger.	Supervisor approves; trainee uses	Script-adherence audit; rate of correctly referred technical questions
Follow-up coordination	Record next action, owner and due date in approved system.	Assigned follow-up owner; supervisor monitors	Share of due follow-ups completed or dispositioned on time

Note. Source: Authors' proposed framework, derived from the earlier manuscript.

These measures would require an approved tracker and a defined evaluation period. None was calculated in this study. The framework aims to make accountability observable, not to assert increased conversions, client understanding or investment quality.

VI. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE EVIDENCE

This study relies on an earlier manuscript rather than an inspectable original OJT report. It has no dated diary, weekly reports, anonymised contact records, incident narratives, approved communication examples, independently verified coding, supervisor review, client feedback or outcome measures. Both students' individual contributions and OJT dates also require confirmation. The available evidence permits thematic description and a proposed evaluation framework, not corroborated incident reconstruction, prevalence estimates or causal inference. With company permission, future work could inspect redacted weekly reports, anonymised process summaries and a supervisor-confirmed responsibility map. Any such material should be checked for confidentiality before inclusion.

VII. CONCLUSION

The accessible OJT case narrative reports outreach, service explanation, meeting coordination and follow-up, alongside challenges of prospect contact, incomplete information, technical explanation and follow-up management. The contribution of this revision is to link those reported themes to explicit source locations and propose role-owned controls with measurable future indicators. Because the underlying records were not supplied, the paper does not claim verified incidents, observed process gains or investment outcomes. Its recommendations remain hypotheses for authorised workplace testing.



Author Contributions — *provisional; confirmation required*

Sakshi Patil: OJT participant; specific workplace activities, source collection, analysis and drafting contribution to be confirmed. Divya Pawar: OJT participant; specific workplace activities, source collection, analysis and drafting contribution to be confirmed. Dr. Shirly Abraham: research supervision; manuscript review and editing (as requested, subject to author confirmation). All authors should approve the final manuscript and agree on a corresponding author before submission.

References

[1] M. Adil, Y. Singh, and M. S. Ansari, "How financial literacy moderate the association between behaviour biases and investment decision?" *Asian J. Account. Res.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 17–30, 2022, doi: 10.1108/AJAR-09-2020-0086.

[2] M. Adil, Y. Singh, M. Subhan, M. A. S. Al-Faryan, and M. S. Ansari, "Do trust in financial institution and financial literacy enhances intention to participate in stock market among Indian investors during COVID-19 pandemic?" *Cogent Econ. Finance*, vol. 11, no. 1, Art. no. 2169998, 2023, doi: 10.1080/23322039.2023.2169998.

[3] G. A. Bowen, "Document analysis as a qualitative research method," *Qual. Res. J.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 27–40, 2009, doi: 10.3316/QRJ0902027.