

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_98237
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of Knowledge Management System on Organizational Ambidexterity: A Conceptual Model
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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1.The manuscript is important for scientific community 2. Title of the article to suitable. 3. Abstract of the article to comprehensive. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript to should improve more, e.g., the results to the analysis table should be added, and discussion to explain the research results. How the research results are consistent and related to past research? 5. Manuscript is scientifically correct, but should improve the conclusion to be concise and comprehensive. 6. References to sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pornchai Jedaman
Department, University & Country	Research and Development Institution, Rajabath Mahasarakham University, Thailand