

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_110596</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Knowledge Management Maturity Level of Steel Fabricator Companies in Indonesia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript holds significance for the scientific community, specifically catering to professionals and researchers in the fields of knowledge management, construction, and industrial competitiveness. The research delves into the knowledge management maturity level of steel fabricator companies in Indonesia, a subject pertinent to the ongoing endeavours in infrastructure development.</li> <li>2. Certainly, minor revisions can be implemented if necessary.</li> <li>3. Insufficient.</li> <li>4. The explanation lacks clarity and requires substantial improvements, particularly in elucidating the model and its variables. There is a notable omission in describing the composition of APO and its consequential impact on business.</li> <li>5. Although the references are present, they need to adhere strictly to the APA 7th edition format, which is missing</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Up to the mark and understandable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There appears to be an inconsistency in the manuscript regarding the number of received questionnaires. While it is highlighted that 37 questionnaires were received, section 3.1 on data collection mentions different samples, such as total respondents, education, and position, all totalling 43. This raises concerns about the researcher's commitment, as there seems to be a discrepancy in the reported numbers—whether it is 37 or 43 questionnaires reviewed needs clarification.</li> <li>• In section 3.2 on the Homogeneity Test, the use of Kruskal-Wallis is mentioned, but the values and indicators are not provided. It is essential to include these details for a comprehensive understanding of the research methodology.</li> <li>• Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 discuss Validity and Reliability Tests. However, it is pointed out that these tests are typically conducted during a pilot study to refine the questionnaire ( before finalising the questionnaire). The absence of values for these tests in the manuscript raises questions about the thoroughness of the research analysis and the researcher's understanding of statistical data.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.4 implies that the model values derived from the tests mentioned above contribute to the Analysis of Knowledge Management Implementation Level. However, it is advised against accepting the model without sufficient justification or data provided.</li> <li>• In the Findings and Discussion section, the claim is made that the maturity level of knowledge management application in steel fabricator companies is 128 points. However, there is a lack of supporting data or proof to substantiate this claim. It is crucial to include the necessary evidence and data to justify such assertions.</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arvind Mallik</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>PES Institute of Technology and Management, India</b>