



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

**International Journal of Innovation Science - Decision on Manuscript ID IJIS-06-2023-0125.R1**

5 messages

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

Fri, Oct 27, 2023 at 12:57 AM

Reply-To: brett@iaoip.org

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

26-Oct-2023

Dear Dr. Yunus:

Manuscript ID IJIS-06-2023-0125.R1 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 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 10-Nov-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:  
Recent Literature related to Innovation and SME should be added.  
Items for moderating variables needs to shown in appendix

**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?: some recent papers related to open Innovation and SMEs need to added.
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?: Research method is apt. Justify the usage of tool.
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?: It clearly identifies the implication for practice
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. But its better to check the language once again.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

**Comments:**

Yazar(lar)ı tebrik ediyorum. Düzeltmeler yazıya uygundur. Makale daha da geliştirildi. Yayınlanmaya uygundur.

**Additional Questions:**

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify 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 demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources. No any significant work ignored.
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?: The paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory. The research which the paper is based been well designed. The methods are employed appropriate.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results are presented clearly and analysed appropriately. The conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper.
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?: The paper bridge the gap between theory and practice. These are implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper.
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.: The paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership. Attention has been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.

Reviewer: 3

Recommendation: Minor Revision

**Comments:**

Thank you very much for the invitation to review the manuscript id IJIS-06-2023-0125.R1 entitled "Awakening the Giant Within: Turning SME's Survival Strategy into Improved Performance." I have the following comments

In general, it is an interesting and well organized manuscript. I have some minor comments

- Could you please add details on how you chose 23 owners for the interview?
- The arguments of Hypotheses 3 and 4 are fragile and need to be strengthened.
- In addition, the utilization of adopted theories in the development of hypotheses would be helpful.
- Page 6 Line 10: "The informant mentioned that mid-2021 to mid-2022 was the most challenging period." Page 10 Line 40: "Data collection took place approximately four months in the middle of 2022." It is confusing please check the dates and clearly mention the actual time.
- What was the response rate of the survey?
- Write beta values instead of t-values in hypothesis testing.
- Provide the interaction graphs.
- Future research directions can be improved.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper is interesting.
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 hypotheses 3 and 4 need to be strengthened.
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?: In general, it is appropriate and adequately described. There are some minor suggestions
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results are interesting and correctly interpreted.
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?: The paper offers some theoretical and practical implications.
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.: Fine.

Reviewer: 4

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

I appreciate your paper.

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?: 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?: yes
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

Fri, Oct 27, 2023 at 7:16 AM

Dear Dr. Brett Trusko,

Thank you for the decision. We will revise the manuscript accordingly and resubmit by the deadline.

Have a nice day!  
Sincerely,  
Erlinda

[Quoted text hidden]

---

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

Fri, Oct 27, 2023 at 2:40 PM

Er, fyi.  
Diminta revisi kedua untuk jurnal Scopus gratis ini, waktu revisi 2 minggu.  
Ada 2 reviewers yang bilang Accept, dan 2 reviewers minta Minor Revisions.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

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

Fri, Oct 27, 2023 at 2:46 PM

Dear Mbak Erl,

Wah kereen Mbak Erl...  
Minor revisinya smg bener2 minor ya hiks  
Hrs dipahami dl nih review nya, alhamdulillah bgt 2 udah accept ya Mbak Erl

Salam  
Ern

[Quoted text hidden]

---

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

Fri, Oct 27, 2023 at 4:46 PM

Iya Er semoga ini revisi terakhir dan bisa publish.  
Rencana aku akan coba revisi dulu weekend ini. Erni ada waktu Senin atau Selasa depan untuk bahas?

[Quoted text hidden]