

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJEBA_118120
Title of the Manuscript:	Flight of the Conchords: The Organisational Culture on the Institutional Strengthening through a Resource-Based View
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript serves as a credible review of literature on organizational culture and from that perspective is worthy. The manuscript also contributes from the perspective of organizational strengthening and RBV. The manuscript's brevity also is a plus in that its contribution is made concisely, efficiently, without "filler."</p> <p>2. I would suggest elimination of the first part of the title – the second portion, with a slight modification, is an appropriate title as follows: "The Influence of Organisational Culture on the Institutional Strengthening through a Resource-Based View."</p> <p>3. The Abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. As far as I am aware, the manuscript correctly cites the material it uses.</p> <p>6. The references are current and correct.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. There are several editorial modifications that would improve the manuscript:</p> <p>a. There are numerous points where the term "in other words" is used to restate something. This becomes distracting and it would be best if the author/authors can phrase things the way they want to start, without relying on constant rephrasing.</p> <p>b. The manuscript will benefit from an additional proof-read to correct some mistakes. For example, the fifth line of the Abstract, "organizational" should be capitalized as it starts a sentence (there are some other mistakes as well).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript provides a nice framework for future work on organizational strengthening by indicating the importance of RVB and does so in a nicely efficient manner.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	James Vanderleeuw
Department, University & Country	Park University, United States