

Correspondence to IJPPM

**From:** luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

**To:** wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id

**CC:**

**Subject:** International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management - Decision on Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-0192

**Body:** 06-Aug-2020

Dear Dr. Arsawan,

Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-0192 entitled "LEVERAGING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND INNOVATION CULTURE INTO SMEs SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE" which you submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. 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/ijppm> 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.

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.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, your

revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation.

If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit:

[authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/](http://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/)

Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

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

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Luisa Huaccho Huatuco

Editor, International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management

[luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk](mailto:luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk)

DEADLINE: 04-Nov-2020

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

Please revise the whole manuscript and especially improve the methodology and analysis part and resubmit.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: **minimum novelty**

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?: **significant literature is added, however, the authors can consider the following papers as well.**

**Bari, M. W., Abrar, M., Shaheen, S., Bashir, M., & Fanchen, M. (2019). Knowledge Hiding Behaviors and Team Creativity: The Contingent Role of Perceived Mastery Motivational Climate. SAGE Open, 9(3), 2158244019876297.**

Bari, M. W., Fanchen, M., & Baloch, M. A. (2016). Management practices and performance of mergers and acquisitions in Pakistan: mediating role of psychological contract. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1527.

Bari, M. W., & Fanchen, M. (2017). Personal interaction drives innovation: Instrumental Guanxi-based knowledge café approach. In *Handbook of research on tacit knowledge management for organizational success* (pp. 176-200). IGI Global.

Shaheen, S., & Bari, M. W. (2019). Organizational cronyism as an antecedent of ingratiation: mediating role of relational psychological contract. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1609.

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?: significant improvement are required, please consider the following papers.

Meng, Y., & Bari, M. W. (2019). Design Perceptions for 3D Printed Accessories of Digital Devices and Consumer-Based Brand Equity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2800.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results and analysis need further improvements.

Please check the assessment and measurement model tables carefully.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The discussion section is underdeveloped, further arguments are required.

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 sentence structure required further improvement.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

Qualified for publication

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper has identified four different types of gaps in the literature, and the research work has provided significant evidence covering the gap in the relationship between knowledge sharing and innovative culture in the context of Indonesian SMEs from Export businesses. The research is an interesting area in the organizational culture connecting innovation and knowledge sharing.

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?: Literature review has covered the secondary evidence from past literature on the key variables including business performance, innovative culture, and knowledge sharing. This provides enough support to build the study hypotheses. The background is also clear to help reader reaching quickly to the objectives.

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 quantitative data was collected from 259 respondents which is appropriate sample size to justify the evidence and to validate results. The use of SmartPLS is another positive feature in the study which is modern tool of analysis. Thus all the methods and data evidence shown in the appropriate.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are appropriate and considered valid for the testing of seven hypotheses. Results have shown that knowledge sharing has significant role in the development of innovative culture, which enhances the business performance, and help achieving the sustainable competitive advantage. The structured model diagram clearly depicts the relationship structure among modal variables.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The paper

has clearly identified the implications, filled the gap in theory and practice, and has helped businesses and society in general through its findings. The implications are aligned to the research findings and objectives.

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 author has adopted clear deductive approach based on scientific evidence. The case was built on the basis of researcher own observation and past literature. The use of language is professional and appropriate justifying the rigor and quality work. It also qualifies the standards specifications of journal. References are relevant and latest.

**Date Sent:** 06-Aug-2020

**Dear Editor and Reviewer**  
**International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management**

Thank you for your constructive feedback to improve the quality and development of our manuscript. In the table below, we try to dig deeper information based on reviewer input. Each repair is marked in yellow in the manuscript to make it easier to identify the improvements we have made.

We hope this improvement can meet the expectations of reviewers. Thank you

No	Comments and Question from Reviewer 1	Revision
1	Please revise the whole manuscript and especially improve the methodology and analysis part and resubmit.	The research methodology has been revised. Page 7-10 (yellow highlight)
2	Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication? minimum novelty	The significant information has been added. Page 2 paragraph 4 (yellow highlight) Page 3 paragraph 1 (yellow highlight) Page 3 paragraph 3 (yellow highlight)
3	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?: significant literature is added, however, the authors can consider the following papers as well	The literature review has been revised and also consider the recommended papers.  Page 4 paragraph 1 (yellow highlight) Page 4 paragraph 4 (yellow highlight) Page 5 paragraph 1 (yellow highlight)
4	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	The research methodology has been revised. Page 7 paragraph 4 (yellow highlight) Page 8 paragraph 3 (yellow highlight) Page 9 paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (yellow highlight)

	<p>methods employed appropriate?: significant improvement are required, please consider the following papers.</p>	<p>Page 10 paragraph 2 (yellow highlight)</p>
5	<p>Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results and analysis need further improvements.</p> <p>Please check the assessment and measurement model tables carefully</p>	<p>We adopted a table display method by adding HTMT Table 5 according to Bari et al. 2019</p> <p>But we also use Hair et al. 2013 and hair et al. 2016 on the mechanism of measuring the outer model and inner model.</p> <p>According to Hair et al. 2013 and 2016, outer model measurement is measured by a three-component approach, namely Convergent validity, discriminant validity, Composite reliability.</p> <p>While inner model measurement is measured by the results of R2 analysis, predict relevance of Stone Geiser (Stone, 1974 &amp; Geiser, 1974) and Goodness of Fit (GoF), effect size (f2).</p> <p>To test the hypotheses we use the coefficient value and compare it with t-statistic where if it is greater than &gt; 1.96 then the hypothesis is called "accepted".</p> <p>Meanwhile, to test the role of mediation we used VAF (Variance Accounted For, Hair et al. 2014).</p>
6	<p>Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The discussion section is underdeveloped, further arguments are required</p>	<p>The research implication has been revised.</p> <p>Page 13 paragraph 1 (yellow highlight)</p> <p>Page 13 paragraph 3 (yellow highlight)</p> <p>Page 14 paragraph 1 (yellow highlight)</p> <p>Page 14 paragraph 2 (yellow highlight)</p>
7.	<p>Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against</p>	<p>Overall, the quality of communication has been improved.</p>

	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 sentence structure required further improvement.	
--	---	--

No	Comments and Question from Reviewer 2	Revision
1	Qualified for publication	We thank reviewers that our manuscript meets the IJPPM qualifications
2	Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The paper has identified four different types of gaps in the literature, and the research work has provided significant evidence covering the gap in the relationship between knowledge sharing and innovative culture in the context of Indonesian SMEs from Export businesses. The research is an interesting area in the organizational culture connecting innovation and knowledge sharing	Thank you. In this manuscript we try to answer 4 research gaps about the importance of conducting this research in the SME sector.
3	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?: Literature review has covered the secondary evidence from past literature on the key variables including business performance, innovative culture, and knowledge sharing. This provides enough support to build the study hypotheses. The background is also clear to help reader reaching quickly to the objectives.	To build a literature review and develop a hypothesis we summarize the research results from previous research.
4	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 quantitative data was collected from 259 respondents which is appropriate sample size to justify the evidence and to validate results. The use of SmartPLS is another positive feature in the study which is modern tool of analysis. Thus all the	This research methodology uses a quantitative design with a positivism approach. Of the 295 responses involved, we processed the tabulated data with statistical procedures according to the research needs. The data were processed using Smart PLS 3.0 with a second order analysis approach

	<p>methods and data evidence shown in the appropriate</p>	
5	<p>Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are appropriate and considered valid for the testing of seven hypotheses. Results have shown that knowledge sharing has significant role in the development of innovative culture, which enhances the business performance, and help achieving the sustainable competitive advantage. The structured model diagram clearly depicts the relationship structure among modal variables.</p>	<p>We adopted a table display method by adding HTMT Table 5 according to Bari et al. 2019</p> <p>But we also use Hair et al. 2013 and hair et al. 2016 on the mechanism of measuring the outer model and inner model.</p> <p>According to Hair et al. 2013 and 2016, outer model measurement is measured by a three-component approach, namely Convergent validity, discriminant validity, Composite reliability.</p> <p>While inner model measurement is measured by the results of R2 analysis, predict relevance of Stone Geiser (Stone, 1974 &amp; Geiser, 1974) and Goodness of Fit (GoF), effect size (f2).</p> <p>To test the hypotheses we use the coefficient value and compare it with t-statistic where if it is greater than &gt; 1.96 then the hypothesis is called "accepted".</p> <p>Meanwhile, to test the role of mediation we used VAF (Variance Accounted For, Hair et al. 2014).</p>
6	<p>Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The paper has clearly identified the implications, filled the gap in theory and practice, and has helped businesses and society in general through its findings. The implications are aligned to the research findings and objectives</p>	<p>We hope that the research results enrich the literature on research variables as well as provide insight to the managers of Export SMEs to pay attention to research variables in an effort to maintain a sustainable competitive advantage</p>

7.	<p>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 author has adopted clear deductive approach based on scientific evidence. The case was built on the basis of researcher own observation and past literature. The use of language is professional and appropriate justifying the rigor and quality work. It also qualifies the standards specifications of journal. References are relevant and latest</p>	<p>Overall, the quality of communication has been improved.</p>
----	--	---

Minor Revision

**From:** luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

**To:** wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id

**CC:**

**Subject:** International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management - Decision on Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-0192.R1

**Body:** 18-Oct-2020

Dear Dr. Arsawan,

Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-0192.R1 entitled "LEVERAGING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND INNOVATION CULTURE INTO SMEs SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE" which you submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

Before Emerald can publish your paper, authors must clear permission to use any content that has not been created by them. Failure to do so may lead to lengthy delays in publication. Emerald is unable to publish any article which has permissions pending. Please see this link for details: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/writing/permissions.htm>

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijppm> 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.

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.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation.

If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: [authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/](http://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/) Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

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

Yours sincerely,  
Dr. Luisa Huaccho Huatuco  
Editor, International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management  
[luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk](mailto:luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk)

DEADLINE: 01-Nov-2020

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:  
Overall, the paper is very well improved however, the following changes are recommended.

Literature is good, however, I recommend the following papers to consider for literature:

Bari, M. W., Abrar, M., Shaheen, S., Bashir, M., & Fanchen, M. (2019). Knowledge Hiding Behaviors and Team Creativity: The Contingent Role of Perceived Mastery Motivational Climate. *SAGE Open*, 9(3), 2158244019876297.

Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.

Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*

Bari, M. W., & Fanchen, M. (2017). Personal interaction drives innovation: Instrumental Guanxi-based knowledge café approach. In *Handbook of research on tacit knowledge management for organizational success* (pp. 176-200). IGI Global.

Please clarify more, the sample collection procedure.  
All measured variables should be in separate paragraphs  
The statistical model should also be explained briefly.  
The quality of communication needs to improve further.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes, its good.

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?: literature is good, however, I recommend the following papers to consider for literature:

Bari, M. W., Abrar, M., Shaheen, S., Bashir, M., & Fanchen, M. (2019). Knowledge Hiding Behaviors and Team Creativity: The Contingent Role of Perceived Mastery Motivational Climate. *SAGE Open*, 9(3), 2158244019876297.

Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.

Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.

Bari, M. W., & Fanchen, M. (2017). Personal interaction drives innovation: Instrumental Guanxi-based knowledge café approach. In *Handbook of research on tacit knowledge management for organizational success* (pp. 176-200). IGI Global.

Thank you for your suggestions. We accommodated all of your recommend papers to enrich the literature review in the knowledge sharing section (Bari et al., 2020) and innovation culture (Bari et al., 2017). In addition to literature reviews, we also improve the development of the hypothesis, especially the relationship among innovation culture and sustainable competitive advantage (H4) hypothesis (Bari et al., 2017). Also, we improvised the managerial implications on how managers build trust to share knowledge with other employees to prevent knowledge hiding behavior (KHBs) according to Bari et al. (2020).

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?: please clarify more, the sample collection procedure.

The population used was 69 export SMEs divided into six business sectors, namely fashion designers and manufacturers, furniture and home decor, spa, aromatic, and specialty products, accessories & jewelry, and services. Using the formula proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970),

a total of 59 SMEs as a sampling frame was derived. This selection was carried out using random sampling (lottery method)

All measured variables should be in separate paragraphs.

Thank you for your suggestion. We already separate all of the measured variables. We've done it in the manuscript with yellow highlights.

The statistical model should also be explained briefly.

We added figure 1 as a research framework to the literature review.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are ok.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: ok.

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 quality of communication needs to improve further.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

Recommending for publication, and author has made improvements after the previous review.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes the paper qualifies the originality criteria.

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?: All key variables of the proposed model are covered in the literature review.

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?: Methodology is appropriate and covering both inner and out domain of the analysis.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Yes, the paper covers the implications, and contributed to fill the gap between theory and 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, the language is clear and suitable for the journal readership.

**Date Sent:** 18-Oct-2020



**International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management**

Inbox - Google 18 October 2020 23.46

International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management - Decision on Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-01...

To: wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id,

[Details](#)

Reply-To: luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

18-Oct-2020

Dear Dr. Arsawan,

Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-0192.R1 entitled "LEVERAGING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND INNOVATION CULTURE INTO SMEs SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE" which you submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

Before Emerald can publish your paper, authors must clear permission to use any content that has not been created by them. Failure to do so may lead to lengthy delays in publication. Emerald is unable to publish any article which has permissions pending. Please see this link for details: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/writing/permissions.htm>

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijppm> 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.

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.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

To help support you on your publishing journey we have partnered with Editage, a leading global science communication platform, to offer expert editorial support including language editing and translation.

If your article has been rejected or revisions have been requested, you may benefit from Editage's services. For a full list of services, visit: [authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/](http://authorservices.emeraldpublishing.com/)  
Please note that there is no obligation to use Editage and using this service does not guarantee publication.

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

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Luisa Huaccho Huatuco  
Editor, International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management  
[luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk](mailto:luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk)

DEADLINE: 01-Nov-2020

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

Overall, the paper is very well improved however, the following changes are recommended.

Literature is good, however, I recommend the following papers to consider for literature:

Bari, M. W., Abrar, M., Shaheen, S., Bashir, M., & Fanchen, M. (2019). Knowledge Hiding Behaviors and Team Creativity: The Contingent Role of Perceived Mastery Motivational Climate. *SAGE Open*, 9(3), 2158244019876297.

Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.

Bari, M. W., Ghaffar, M., & Ahmad, B. (2020). Knowledge-hiding behaviors and employees' silence: mediating role of psychological contract breach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.

Bari, M. W., & Fanchen, M. (2017). Personal interaction drives innovation: Instrumental Guanxi-based knowledge café approach. In *Handbook of research on tacit knowledge management for*

## Revision Minor



**International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management**

Inbox - Google 28 October 2020 18:06

International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management - IJPPM-04-2020-0192.R2

To: wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id, Viktor Koval, ismi\_rajiani@umd.ac.id, rusti\_arini@unmas.ac.id, & 2 more

[Details](#)

Reply-To: jeniwebster123@gmail.com

28-Oct-2020

Dear Dr. Arsawan,

Your revised manuscript entitled "LEVERAGING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND INNOVATION CULTURE INTO SMEs SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management.

Your manuscript ID is IJPPM-04-2020-0192.R2.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijppm> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Centre after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijppm>

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision or send directly to Emerald if your paper is accepted immediately. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Open Access?

All of our subscription journals give you the option of publishing your article open access, following payment of an article processing charge (APC). To find the APC for your journal, please refer to the APC price list: [http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/openaccess/apc\\_price\\_list.pdf](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/openaccess/apc_price_list.pdf)

Emerald has established partnerships with national consortium bodies to offer a number of APC vouchers for eligible regions and institutions. To check your eligibility please refer to the open access partnerships page: <http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/openaccess/oapartnerships.htm>

If you would like to publish your article open access please contact [openaccess@emeraldgroup.com](mailto:openaccess@emeraldgroup.com)

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management.

Yours sincerely,  
Jennifer Webster  
International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8493-5249>

Accepted



**International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management**

Inbox - Google 15 November 2020 01.44

International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management - Decision on Manuscript ID IJPPM-04-2020-01...

[Details](#)

To: wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id, Viktor Koval, ismi\_rajiani@umd.ac.id, rusti\_arini@unmas.ac.id, & 2 more

Reply-To: luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk

14-Nov-2020

Dear Arsawan, I Wayan; Koval, Viktor; Rajiani, Ismi; Rustiarini, Ni Wayan; Supartha, Wayan; Suryantini, Ni Putu

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript IJPPM-04-2020-0192.R2, entitled "LEVERAGING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND INNOVATION CULTURE INTO SMEs SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE" in its current form for publication in International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management. Please note, no further changes can be made to your manuscript.

Please go to your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ijppm> (Manuscripts with Decisions for the submitting author or Manuscripts I have co-authored for all listed co-authors) to complete the Copyright Transfer Agreement form (CTA). We cannot publish your paper without this.

All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details. If any of the contact information is incorrect you can update it by clicking on your name at the top right of the screen. Please note that this must be done prior to you submitting your CTA.

If you have an ORCID please check your account details to ensure that your ORCID is validated.

By publishing in this journal your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. As soon as your CTA is completed your manuscript will pass to Emerald's Content Management department and be processed for EarlyCite publication. EarlyCite is the author proofed, typeset version of record, fully citable by DOI. The EarlyCite article sits outside of a journal issue and is paginated in isolation. The EarlyCite article will be collated into a journal issue according to the journals' publication schedule.

FOR OPEN ACCESS AUTHORS: Please note if you have indicated that you would like to publish your article as Open Access via Emerald's Gold Open Access route, you are required to complete a Creative Commons Attribution Licence - CCBY 4.0 (in place of the standard copyright assignment form referenced above). You will receive a follow up email within the next 30 days with a link to the CCBY licence and information regarding payment of the Article Processing Charge. If you have indicated that you might be eligible for a prepaid APC voucher, you will also be informed at this point if a voucher is available to you (for more information on APC vouchers please see <http://www.emeraldpublishing.com/oapartnerships>)

Thank you for your contribution. On behalf of the Editors of International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Luisa Huaccho Huatuco

Editor, International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management

[luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk](mailto:luisa.huatuco@york.ac.uk)

## Final Proofread Before Publish



**International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management**

Inbox - Google 15 November 2020 01:44

Self-archiving Instructions

To: wayanediarsawan@pnb.ac.id,

Reply-To: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

14-Nov-2020

Dear Arsawan, I Wayan; Koval, Viktor; Rajiani, Ismi; Rustiarini, Ni Wayan; Supartha, Wayan; Suryantini, Ni Putu,

**"LEVERAGING KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND INNOVATION CULTURE INTO SMEs SUSTAINABLE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE"**

Effective from September 2017, Emerald has removed the embargo period across all journals for the self-archiving of the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM). This enables all of our authors to make their article open access via a 'green' route. The full text of the article may therefore become visible within your personal website, institutional repository (IR), subject repository, SCN signed up to the Voluntary STM Sharing Principles as soon as the final version has been published in the journal. It may also be shared with interested individuals, for teaching and training purposes at your own institution and for grant applications.

Please refer to the terms of your own institution to ensure full compliance.

The date your article was accepted for publication was: (14-Nov-2020)

If you are required to deposit your article in your institution's repository, you will need to:

- Either, manually deposit the accepted manuscript attached to this email or a version from your own records (it must be the version accepted for publication by the journal's Editor) into your repository
- Or if applicable, forward your accepted manuscript to your institution's Repository Manager.
- If you are unsure which option is applicable to you, please refer to your institutional or departmental publication policy;

To deposit your AAM, you will need to adhere to the following conditions:

- You must include the DOI (10.1108/JPPM-04-2020-0192) back to the official published version of your article within [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com);
- Include all of the relevant metadata (article title, journal name, volume, issue no. etc.).
- The AAM must clearly indicate where the article was published, or where it is forthcoming;
- Include a clear licensing statement (see below).

Deposit licences

Emerald allows authors to deposit their AAM under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial International Licence 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0). To do this, the deposit must clearly state that the AAM is deposited under this licence and that any reuse is allowed in accordance with the terms outlined by the licence. To reuse the AAM for commercial purposes, permission should be sought by contacting [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com).

For the sake of clarity, commercial usage would be considered as, but not limited to:

- o Copying or downloading AAMs for further distribution for a fee;
- o Any use of the AAM in conjunction with advertising;
- o Any use of the AAM by for promotional purposes by for-profit organisations;
- o Any use that would confer monetary reward, commercial gain or commercial exploitation.