



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">British Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19168
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Relationships between Knowledge Transfer, Knowledge Dissemination Capability and Inter-Organizational Dynamics in Public and Private Sectors Organizations</b>
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The theme is interesting, but the structure then the article does not in itself provide such relevance. The introduction presents the very extensive form of theme for introduction. References to previous studies make more sense in section 2 which is carried out literature review. Not in the introduction.</p> <p>Section 2 performs the literature review, but in truth, it does not allow to understand the gap in the literature that the authors found, and will seek to resolve here. There are clearly presented, the fundamentals of literature, previous studies have allowed deduce hypotheses that will study. References to previous studies that makes the introduction should come to section 2. Attention, that the Hypothesis are only set out one by one, and deducted from literature. The authors refer to the application of an analytical model taken from Simonin (1999), Grant (1996), Argote, and McEvily Reagans (2003), and Easterby-Smith and Lyles Tsang (2008). But even seem necessary to explain the contribution of each one of those studies, with regard to cases that will study. You will need to make clear the rise of each hypothesis. This is the</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>main weakness of the article, since the hypothetical-deductive method implies that the investigator presents evidence on the deduction of hypotheses.</p> <p>Section 4.1 is very synthetic. It allows knowing the sample characterization data in more detail. For example it is not clear demographic affiliation of Table 1, which is the acronym "HKIE" and following?</p> <p>The results discussion section does not contrast the results obtained. See that does not discuss the reasons for the failure to confirm the hypotheses 1, 2 and 4. Lack a more explicit discussion of the results and the previous literature studies.</p> <p>Finally, the final conclusions should come after the discussion of the results. Only after the findings present limitations and future investigations.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The introduction should include a brief presentation of the structure of the article-	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Polytechnic Institute of Coimbra, Portugal</i></b>