

[EBER] Submission Acknowledgement

Yahoo/Email Masuk

•

Editorial Board <eber@uek.krakow.pl>

Kepada:Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

Sen, 13 Apr 2020 jam 12.34

Hello,

Putu Yudy Wijaya and Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih has submitted the manuscript, "The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance: A Study of Silver Craft SMEs" to Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review.

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

[EBER OJS] Editorial Board

[EBER] Editor Decision on #901 - Resubmit for review2

Yahoo/Terkirim

Dr Agnieszka Wałęga <agnieszka.walega@uek.krakow.pl>

Kepada:Putu Yudy Wijaya,Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

Sab, 9 Mei 2020 jam 18.07

[Article ID: #901]

Dear Putu Yudy Wijaya, Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review, "The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance: A Study of Silver Craft SMEs".

Our decision is to: **RESUBMIT FOR REVIEW**

Please find attached the reviews:

- 1) internal review on technical and editorial aspects
- 2) at least two external independent reviewer

RESUBMIT FOR REVIEW means that the article will be sent for the **second round of reviewing** and it will be checked carefully if the suggestions and comments of the reviewers were taken into consideration and applied in the revised version of your article, so please take time to improve your article accordingly.

Please provide a **point-by-point response** to the reviewer's comments and upload it as a Word/PDF file.

Please do it in the following way:

http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_Authors_Statement_after_the_Reviews.doc

Please include all changes in your article in **RED COLOUR** (or using 'Track Changes' option in MS Word) to let us know what was changed.

Please send us a revised version of your article **within 4-6 weeks from now**, that means no later than on ***** INSERT DATE *****

PLEASE DO NOT FORGET:

Please **respond to all comments of the reviewers** by sending us the statement (download the statement from:

http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_Authors_Statement_after_the_Reviews.docx fill it in and upload it back to OJS)

Best regards,

Editor of EBER responsible for your article
Dr Agnieszka Wałęga

Cracow University of Economics
agnieszka.walega@uek.krakow.pl

=== Dr Agnieszka Wałęga Cracow University of Economics Department of Statistics ===

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

(1) AIM AND SCOPE OF EBER

We accept articles only on (i) entrepreneurship and (ii) international business/economics. We prefer articles dedicated to Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) or South-East Europe (SEE), nevertheless if the article is really good we can accept other geographical scope of the article.

The paper does not fit directly into the scope of the journal

(2) ORIGINALITY, NOVELTY AND CONTRIBUTION

*Is the research problem original and a kind of novelty or is it just the compilation of other studies? Does the article bring something new? Does the paper make a (significant) contribution to the research theme? Did the Author explain **in the introduction** what is the originality and novelty of this article? If not, we can not accept this article for publication.*

NOTE: We accept moderate original works (a kind of novelty), they don't have to be a pioneer novelty, but we will not accept a traditional well-known topics, compilations of other studies.

The Author did not explain in the introduction what is the originality and novelty of this article.

(3) Scientific Soundness and Research Excellence

Is the article suitable for its research excellence?
NOTES:

*a) We **accept** articles with a solid methodology, preferably **solid quantitative design** (statistical tests or econometric modeling, simple statistical correlations are not accepted), but also **solid qualitative design** (strong and innovative qualitative methodology, a simple description of data or "easy" case studies are not accepted).*

*a) We **do NOT** accept articles which are based on a domestic (local, national) literature written in a national language other than English.*

*b) We **do NOT** accept articles which are focused only on a small localisation (a town, a city or a region, which is beyond the scope of EBER and which are not supported by a good theory review).*

The article is focused only on a small localization which is beyond the scope of EBER

(4) ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND ITS STYLE

*Is the English used correct and readable? Note: We use **British English** (We accept exceptions only for native Americans).*

Moderate English changes required (proofreading by a native speaker is recommended)

(5) TITLE

a) *Is the title **proper and suitable** to the text and reflects its content? Is it short enough?*

b) *The title can't include abbreviations!*

c) *The Title is Written According to EBER Rules, so **The First Letter in Each Word Starts with The Capital Letter.***

Ok

(6) ABSTRACT AND TITLE PAGE

a) *Is the abstract accurate and **informative**? Does it include all necessary elements?*

b) *Does it include the sentence "**The objective of the article is...**" ?*

Ok

(7) STRUCTURE

*The article **must** include the requested structure for EBER.*

Ok

(8) INTRODUCTION

*The introduction section of the article includes **five** elements:*

a) **justification for the topic** why it is important, stating the research gap

b) **the novelty of topic** and the contribution to knowledge/science/literature

c) **objective** of the article and **research questions**

d) **brief information on methods** (one - two sentences)

e) brief description of the content of **each section of the article** the last paragraph of the introduction

Please ask Autho(r) to complete what is missing?

Please complete in the introduction:

1. the novelty of topic and the contribution to knowledge/science/literature
 2. brief information on methods (one - two sentences)
 3. brief description of the content of each section of the article the last paragraph of the introduction
-

(9) LITERATURE REVIEW: PRIOR STUDIES AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT:

GENERAL ISSUES: *Is the literature review properly prepared? Is primary literature correctly summarized? Does the literature review show who dealt with similar research topic before? Does the literature review show what are the results of the prior studies? Did the Author position himself/herself among the previous researchers? Are different options/perspectives from the literature covered in the reviewed article? Is the difference with existing studies explicitly identified and documented? Does the text include references whenever necessary?*

COMPREHENSIVE PRIOR LITERATURE: *Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work? Does the paper include a good review of literature in the researched field? Is the literature review comprehensive, complex and logic? Are there main important authors included? Did the Author show the results of other researchers who have dealt with the same problem so far? Were the previous research results identified in the article? Are different options/perspectives from the literature covered in the reviewed article? Did the Author position himself/herself among the previous researchers?*

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT: *Are the hypotheses "retrieved" from the prior empirical studies and prior literature? We suggest to put the hypothesis in the literature review section as the hypotheses should be developed and based on previous studies and the literature!*

QUALITY OF LITERATURE: *Is only English-language literature used? Is the used literature mainly from Web of Science and Scopus? What about the use of recent studies inside the references these published for last five years?*

*If the quality level of the literature review must be improved, please provide the Author with **further suggested references to be used/cited:***

The Author did not position himself/herself among the previous researchers.

(10) METHODOLOGY - MATERIAL AND METHODS:

The research methodology section (Material and Methods - is compulsory in EBER) includes:

- a) the description of **material or data** - how was it gathered? from where the data were obtained?
- b) description of used **variables** and its measures
- c) the description of the **research methods**
- d) **hypotheses or propositions** (can be included in the Literature Review section):

(1) the hypothesis (-es) if the article is empirical or

(2) the theoretical proposition(s) if the article is theoretical/conceptual.

We suggest to put your hypothesis in the literature review section as the hypotheses should be developed and based on previous studies and the literature!

Is the research design appropriate?

The Author did not explain how was the sample selected, is it representative?

(11) RESULTS / FINDINGS:

a) Did the Author provide us with the tables of empirical results (statistical tests, econometric modelling)?

b) Are the (empirical) results discussed in details? Is the reasoning sound? Has the Author given the appropriate interpretation of the data and references?

The Author presents the results of the modeling but without any comments. There is no information about the results. The Author did not give any interpretation of the results.

The Author wrote: "there are two indicators that are invalid..." (p. 6), but on the next page, there was written that "the three indicators are eliminated from the model..." It is a little bit inconsistent. Why was the indicator Z32 eliminated, but Y12 (or Z21) not? Please comment on it.

There is no source below the tables 1 and 2.

The Author wrote: "The remaining 77% is explained ..." (p. 8). Shouldn't be 78% there?

(12) SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION

Are the findings in the article compared to findings of other authors, prior studies? This is a must!

The findings were not compared to the findings of other authors, prior studies. Please refill this.

(13) CONCLUSION:

This part must include 4 compulsory elements:

a) **general summary/overview** of (empirical) results and findings

b) **practical implications** and recommendations for practice (managers, business/industry or policy makers)

c) description of **research limitations**

d) suggestions for **future research** directions

Does this article include all the above mentioned elements? What is missing?

There is no in the conclusion:
- description of research limitations
- suggestions for future research directions

(14) RECENT BIBLIOGRAPHY (ONLY IN ENGLISH) from Web of Science / Scopus

a) Did the Author use **recent studies** inside the references these published for **last 5 years**?

b) The bibliography includes mainly references indexed in **Web of Science** or **SCOPUS**.

c) This article includes **no more than 2-3 references** in other languages than English and we can accept it.

d) The references/sources are provided for all **tables** and **figures** (we required number of pages).

e) All statistical data and citations are provided with sources/references.

f) All **citations** are provided with sources/references with exact **page numbers**.

Ok

(15) TECHNICAL, EDITORIAL AND LAYOUT COMMENTS:

-

(16) OTHER/FURTHER COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR(S):

-

EDITORIAL DECISION / GENERAL EVALUATION:

- RESUBMIT FOR RE-CONSIDERATION (resubmit for second internal review)
-

Reni Kenanga <reni_kenanga@yahoo.com>

Kepada:Dr Agnieszka Wałęga

Sen, 11 Mei 2020 jam 22.14

[Article ID: #901]

Dear Dr Agnieszka Walega:

We are pleased to resubmit the revised version of our manuscript, 'The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance: A Study of Silver Craft SMEs', for publication with response to the reviewer's comments (at EBER platform). First of all, we would like to thank the reviewer for taking the time and reviewing our paper. We have revised the paper according to the suggestions, which particularly helped to clarify some inaccuracies. As a result, we believe that the quality of the paper has much improved. Please see below our response to the reviewer comments (held in red) and a description of the changes in the manuscript.

Please check it again, and inform me about the progress.

Thank You.

Best regards,

Putu Yudy Wijaya, Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

[EBER] Editor Decision on #901 - Revisions required

Yahoo/Email Masuk

Dr Agnieszka Wałęga <agnieszka.walega@uek.krakow.pl>

Kepada:Putu Yudy Wijaya,Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

Jum, 21 Agu 2020 jam 03.05

[Article ID #901]

Dear dr Putu Yudy Wijaya, dr Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to 'Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review', "The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance: A Study of Silver Craft SMEs".

Our decision is: **REVISIONS REQUIRED.**

Please find attached the reviews:

- 1) internal review on technical and editorial aspects
- 2) two external independent reviewers

Please provide a **point-by-point** response to the reviewer's comments and upload it as a Word/PDF file.

Please do it in the following way:

http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_Authors_Statement_after_the_Reviews.doc

Please include all changes in your article in **RED COLOUR** (or using 'Track Changes' option in MS Word) to let us know what was changed.

Please send us a revised version of your article **within 3-4 weeks from now**, that means no later than on ***** 17 SEPTEMBER 2020 *****

PLEASE DO NOT FORGET:

1) Please **respond to all comments of the reviewers** by sending us the statement (download the statement from:

http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_Authors_Statement_after_the_Reviews.docx fill it in and upload it back to OJS)

2) Please send us your agreement to publish your article (**Copyright Transfer**), without it, we will not be able to do it as this is the law in Poland (download the form from

http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_COPYRIGHT_TRANSFER_author_statement.docx then fill it in and upload it back via OJS)

3) Please DO NOT forget to reveal **your name on the first page** of the revised version of the article, fill in the **submission date**, and the **revision date** (this is the day that you submit the revised article back to us) as well as the biographic entry **Authors' Box** at the end of the article.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

1. ORIGINALITY, NOVELTY AND CONTRIBUTION:

OBJECTIVE: Is the objective of the article proper? Is it met? Are the purpose and rationale for the article clearly stated?

*NOVELTY: Is the research problem original and a kind of novelty or is it just the compilation of other studies? Does the article bring something new? Does the paper make a (significant) contribution to the research theme? Did the Author explain **in the introduction** what is the originality and novelty of this article? If not, we can not accept this article for publication.*

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

The objective of the article is proper and it is met. The purpose and rationale for the article are clearly stated.
The research problem is original and the approach is novel. The article provides moderate contribution to the topic of business performance and knowledge management benefits in relation to the SME community. The author explained the originality and novelty of the article.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

2. LITERATURE REVIEW: PRIOR STUDIES AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT:

COMPREHENSIVE PRIOR LITERATURE: Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work? Does the paper include a good review of literature in the researched field? Is the literature review comprehensive, complex and logic? Are there main important authors included? Did the Author show the results of other researchers who have dealt with the same problem so far? Were the previous research results identified in the article? different options/perspectives from the literature covered in the reviewed article? Did the Author position himself/herself among the previous researchers?

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT: Are the hypotheses "retrieved" from the prior empirical studies and prior literature? We suggest to put the hypothesis in the literature review section as the hypotheses should be developed and based on previous studies and the literature!

QUALITY OF LIETRATURE: Is only English-language literature used? Is the used literature mainly from Web of Science and Scopus? What about the use of recent studies inside the references these published for last five years? Are

*If the quality level of the literature review must be improved, please provide the Author with **further suggested references to be used/cited:***

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

The paper includes a sound, comprehensive and up-to-date literature review which is relevant to the topic. Given the context of the research, the review could also include findings on knowledge management that relate to the notion absorptive capacity (for example, please see Cohen and Levinthal 1990; Zahra and George, 2002). Hypotheses should be clarified and elaborated in a clear manner.

English language and style are fine/minor spell check required

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

6. OTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR THE AUTHOR(S):

Formal aspects: Title, Content, Structure, Introduction, Conclusion and others.
Clarity of Content: Is the article well organized and comprehensively described?
Quality of Presentation: Are the results clearly presented and the conclusions supported by the results?

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

In the given context of studying knowledge management and business performance among small and medium legal entities, it is important to include the concept of absorptive capacity. The ability of knowledge to undergo transformation within an organisation, the knowledge stickiness phenomena, and the capacity of organisations to apply absorbed knowledge for competitive ends all need to be reflected in the paper, especially as these factors affect business performance directly or indirectly. Special focus should be given on the knowledge transformation element and its relation to the knowledge management model in the paper.

7. Scientific Soundness:

Is the article suitable for its research excellence?
If not, this article can not be published in its current form.

can be improved

8. PUBLICATION RECOMMENDATION

REVISIONS REQUIRED - MINOR CHANGES

9. Do you want to see the revised article again prior the final acceptance for publication?

No

With very best wishes,
EBER Editor responsible for your article

Dr Agnieszka Wałęga
Cracow University of Economics
agnieszka.walega@uek.krakow.pl

=== Dr Agnieszka Wałęga Cracow University of Economics Departmernt of Statistics ===

[EBER] Editor Decision on #901 - Accept submission

Yahoo/Email Masuk

•

EBER Editorial Board <eber@uek.krakow.pl>

Kepada:Putu Yudy Wijaya,Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

Rab, 26 Agu 2020 jam 20.45

[Article ID: #901]

Dear Putu Yudy Wijaya, Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to , entitled "The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance: A Study of Silver Craft SMEs".

Our decision is to: ACCEPT SUBMISSION for the next step that is for antyplagiarism system CROSS CHECK

PLEASE DO NOT FORGET:

1) Please send us your agreement to publish your article, without it, we will not be able to do it as this is the law in Poland (download the form from http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_COPYRIGHT_TRANSFER_author_statement.docx then fill it in and upload it back via OJS)

2) Please DO NOT forget to reveal your name on the first page of the revised version of the article, fill in the submission date, and the revision date (this is the day that you submit the revised article back to us) as well as the biographic entry at the end of the article. Make sure you use our template (http://centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_article_template_v2015-12-31.docx).

With very best wishes,
Thematic Editor of EBER

EBER Editorial Board
Cracow University of Economics
Phone +48 12 293 5376
eber@uek.krakow.pl

EBER Editorial Board

===== Izabela Nowakowska, MA Editorial Secretary - Secretariat Office
===== Prof. Agnieszka Głodowska, PhD Editorial
Secretary ===== Prof. Krzysztof Wach,
PhD Editor-in-Chief =====

[EBER] Editor Decision

2020-11-03 05:26 PM

Putu Yudy Wijaya, Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih:

The editing of your submission, "The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance: A Study of Silver Craft SMEs," is complete. We are now sending it to production.

Submission URL: <https://eber.uek.krakow.pl/index.php/eber/authorDashboard/submission/901>

Prof. UEK, dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska
Editorial Secretary, Cracow University of Economics
glodowska@uek.krakow.pl

==== Prof. UEK dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska Secretary of EBER Editorial Board Cracow University of Economics Department of International Trade ====

Participants

- Dr Agnieszka Wałęga (walegam)
- EBER Editorial Board (eber)
- Prof. UEK, dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska (glodowska)
- Putu Yudy Wijaya (yudywijaya)
- Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih (nsuasih)

Messages

Note

From

Dear Authors,

waleg

Aug 2

We checked the article in the anti-plagiarism system - the results of verification you can find in the attachment. Due to the high level of similarity obtained in the anti-plagiarism system (25%), you are asked for making corrections in the article.

Please upload the revised article in our system before September 27, 2020.

Best regards,

Agnieszka Wałęga

[eber, 901 Similarity Report - excluded bibliography.pdf](#)

Settings

yudyw

Sep 0

Dear Dr. Agnieszka Wałęga

We have paraphrased several sentences without changing the substance of meaning. Paper attached. Please inform us again if there are more problems.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

[yudywijaya, 901-Article Text-5328-1-2-20200413 - Resubmit for Review 3.doc](#)

Dear Authors,

Please find attached the results of the latest similarity report.

For the first time the indicator was 25%, for the second time the indicator is 20%.

According to the rules we can accept up to 10% (in your case it is 20% so exceeded).

We will let you know our decision after we will discuss your case as the Editorial Board.

Best regards,

EBER Secretariat

[eber, 901_The Effect of Knowledge Management on Competit \(2\).pdf](#)

[Settings](#)

Dear Prof. Agnieszka Wałęga

We thank you for the plagiarism check results from the previous results.

We apologize in advance, we are not aware of the plagiarism threshold set by the journal editorial team,

We have revised articles related to plagiarism, and checked plagiarism, the results we got were 15% plagiarism. (Plagiarism check result is attached).

The identified plagiarism from our article by the plagiarism application is only the words related to the research variable, citation. conjunction. We also attach revised articles and check results for plagiarism.

We ask for the editorial team's discretion to accept our articles.

Thank you

Best Regards

Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

eber

Sep 0

yudyw

Sep 0

[yudywijaya, 901-Article Text-5328-1-2-20200413 - Resubmit for Review 4.doc yudywijaya, Similiry the effect of Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage and Business Performance A Study of Silver Craft SME.pdf](#)

Dear Authors,

We do accept the current 15% report.

Now we will send your article to copyediting and get back to you after linguistic editing.

Best regards,

EBER Secretariat

Participants

- Dr Agnieszka Wałęga (walegam)
- Prof. UEK, dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska (glodowska)
- Putu Yudy Wijaya (yudywijaya)
- Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih (nsuasih)

Messages

Note

From

Dear Authors,

glodo

Oct 2

Your article has gone through the first stage of copyediting. Please read language copyeditor's comments and take the following steps:

- Copyedited file is in Word "Track Changes" mood. Please keep this mood to let us know what did you change/introduce to the text. Therefore, please response to all questions and commentaries using this function.
- If you add any new fragments to the article, please mark them clearly for us, be it with "Track Changes" or a separate commentary.
- After you send your work back, we will read it one more time in search of minor errors and inconsistencies.

Please undertake this task in 4 days, no later till Monday – October, 26.

[glodowska, 901 Copyediting for AUTHORS.docx](#)

Settings

yudyw

Nov 0

Dear editor,

We have made improvements according to the revision and provided comments on the review results during the copyediting step.

We apologize of this late.

Thank You.

Note

From

Yudy and Reni

[yudywijaya, 901-Article Text-7436-1-18-20201022 - EDITED.docx](#)

[EBER] Copyediting Review Request #901

[Close Panel](#)

Participants

- Prof. UEK, dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska (glodowska)
- Putu Yudy Wijaya (yudywijaya)

Messages

Note

Dear Authors,

Please response as soon as possible to our mail send on October 22 about copyediting review.

Best regards,

Agnieszka Głodowska

Prof. UEK, dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska
Editorial Secretary, Cracow University of Economics
glodowska@uek.krakow.pl

==== Prof. UEK dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska Secretary of EBER Editorial Board Cracow University
of Economics Department of International Trade ====

Proofreading Request to the Author (#901)

[Close Panel](#)

Participants

- Prof. UEK, dr hab. Agnieszka Głodowska (glodowsa)
- Putu Yudy Wijaya (yudywijaya)
- Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih (nsuasih)

Messages

Note

From

Dear Authors:

glodo

Nov 2

Thank you for your contribution to a forthcoming issue of EBER. Please see in our online system the proofs of your article (PDF file) prepared by our DTP specialist. The number of pages will be changed after the final DTP – after corrections of all articles.

We would appreciate if you could prepare the author's correction of the proofs within the following 3 days, no later than on 30 November 2020.

While doing a correction, please be as precise as it is possible. Mark all places when you want to change something in yellow, please! When you want to add a missing word, please state exactly between which words. Please send us the detailed instruction, e.g. “Old text” CHANGE TO “New Text”.

You can see the example of a good correction

at: www.centre.uek.krakow.pl/EBER/EBER_correction_example.pdf (Please use it as the example).

Please remember that at this stage you are entitled to introduce only **minor necessary changes**. Please note that we can only make changes in the event of a major catastrophe, and cannot at this stage make any textual or minor formatting changes. Thank you for your understanding.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

Agnieszka Głodowska

EBER Editorial Office

[glodowska, 901 Authors Correction-Wijaya,Suasih.pdf](#)

[Settings](#)

Dear Editor,

We've corrected the proof as your instruction. Please check again.

Thank You,

Warm regards,

Putu Yudy Wijaya and Ni Nyoman Reni Suasih

[yudywijaya, 901-Article Text-7843-1-18-20201128 - PROOF.pdf](#)

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your soon response and work on te text.

Best regards,

Agnieszka Głodowska

