



Erlinda Yunus &lt;yunus.erlinda@gmail.com&gt;

**International Journal of Innovation Science - Decision on Manuscript ID IJIS-06-2023-0125**

3 messages

**International Journal of Innovation Science** <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

Mon, Jul 31, 2023 at 11:40 PM

Reply-To: brett@iaoip.org

To: erl@ppm-manajemen.ac.id, yunus.erlinda@gmail.com

31-Jul-2023

Dear Dr. Yunus:

Manuscript ID IJIS-06-2023-0125 entitled "Awakening the Giant Within: Turning SME's Survival Strategy into Improved Performance" which you submitted to the International Journal of Innovation Science, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended major revisions to the submitted manuscript, before it can be considered for publication. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijins> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre. The deadline for uploading a revised manuscript is 05-Sep-2023 from receiving this email. If it is not possible for you to resubmit your revision within this timeframe, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please send these to Emerald as soon as possible. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the International Journal of Innovation Science and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Brett Trusko  
Editor, International Journal of Innovation Science  
[brett@iaoip.org](mailto:brett@iaoip.org)

Reviewer(s)' and Associate Editor Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:  
Interesting paper. Add recent literature on innovation performance

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The topic is interesting and justified for publication
2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: The paper lacks recent literature on innovation performance
3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Kindly clarify
  1. why mixed methodology
  2. Sampling method used for Quantitative approach
  3. Measures such as convergent validity and discriminant validity should be mentioned
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: yes
5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Managerial implication needs to be revised.
6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Language and typo errors needs to be checked once

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

I read the article "Awakening the Giant Within: Turning SME's Survival Strategy into Improved Performance". The authors have put great deal of effort, the structuring and the cohesiveness throughout is really appreciated. However, I have some minor concerns that I suggest authors to address.

Introduction:

The introduction starts well by highlighting the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the global economy and SMEs, particularly in developing countries like Indonesia. However, it lacks a clear and concise research objective. Please provide a specific research objective or research question that you aim to address in this study. It would be beneficial to include a brief overview of the structure of the paper to guide the readers through the upcoming sections.

Literature Review:

Provide a rationale for selecting the batik industry as the focus of your study. Why is this sector representative and relevant for investigating SMEs' responses to the pandemic?

Methodology:

The description of the qualitative and quantitative approaches is clear. However, more details are needed on the data collection process, the interview questions used in the phenomenological study, and how the respondents were selected for the quantitative survey.

Elaborate on how the instrument for the quantitative study was developed based on the themes identified in the phenomenological study.

Provide more information on the demographics of the SMEs that participated in both the qualitative and quantitative studies (e.g., size, location, years in operation) to help the readers understand the context of the findings better.

Results and Discussion:

Present the results of the qualitative study separately from the quantitative study. Include direct quotes or rich statements from the SME owners to illustrate the themes that emerged during the phenomenological interviews. The discussion section should be more extensive and should compare the findings with existing literature. How do your findings align with or differ from previous research on SMEs and crisis responses? Discuss the implications of the results in more detail, both for theory and practice.

Make sure to link the discussion back to the research questions or objectives mentioned in the introduction.

Conclusion:

Revise the conclusion to summarize the main findings of the study and emphasize their significance in the context of SMEs and the COVID-19 pandemic.

Clearly state the limitations of the study and offer suggestions for future research in this area.

**Additional Questions:**

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes
2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes
3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: No
5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: No
6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Yes

Associate Editor

Comments to the Author:

(There are no comments.)

---

**Erlinda Yunus** <yunus.erlinda@gmail.com>  
To: brett@iaoip.org

Tue, Aug 1, 2023 at 7:38 AM

Dear Dr. Brett Trusko,

Thank you for your email. We will revise accordingly and resubmit before the deadline.

Sincerely,  
Erlinda

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Erlinda Yunus** <yunus.erlinda@gmail.com>  
To: Erni Ernawati <erniernawati344@gmail.com>

Wed, Aug 2, 2023 at 7:13 AM

Hai Er,

berikut feedback dari Reviewers. Aku lampirkan juga manuskrip kita (versi Word dan PDF).  
Mohon dibantuu... terima kasih ya.Salam,  
Erl

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**3 attachments** **Tables and Figures.docx**  
123K **Awakening the Giant Within-070623.docx**  
155K **draft\_Proof\_hi.pdf**  
348K