

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_129184
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploration and Exploitation Strategies in SMEs: Insights from a Bibliometric Study on Organizational Ambidexterity
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Reviewer's Blind Review Comments to Author

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. Originality: Good</p> <p>2. Scientific Quality: The scientific quality of the manuscript is commendable, with notable strengths in its empirical rigor and relevance to current issues</p> <p>3. Relevance to the Field(s) of this Journal:very relevant. Good article and very essential for the academic contributions.</p> <p>4. General Comment:very good research article but some amendments are crucial to justify the findings accordingly</p> <p>5. Abstract:good</p> <p>6. Introduction:standardized the path of this article</p> <p>7. Literature Review:Good but can be improvised by adding recent articles to justify the objectives</p> <p>8. Methodology:in fact, no obvious methodology has been explained in the article.</p> <p>9. Results:good discussion on the Res Objectives. Apparently details justification explained on previous section and align with the results.</p> <p>10. Discussions:need to change the heading (format)</p> <p>11. Conclusions:the discussion and conclusion carried out by defining the results. However only few results mentioned in this article</p> <p>12. References / Bibliography:few references missing but in citation. please check your citation accordingly</p> <p>13.Others: Grammatical Issues: There are minor grammatical and syntactical issues throughout the manuscript that detract from the overall readability. A thorough proofreading would improve the paper along with a better arrangement of the manuscript. Formatting Consistency: Some sections have inconsistent formatting, particularly in the references and headings. Ensuring a uniform style, especially according to the journal's guidelines, would enhance professionalism.</p> <p>14. Reviewer's Decision Comment: The paper offers a valuable contribution to understanding the Exploitation Strategies in SMEs in Organizational Ambidexterity</p> <p>However, some areas need great improvement, particularly in the critical engagement with literature among the variables, the depth of methodological explanation, the results and the discussion (should be inclusive of all RQs and ROs) and the articulation of practical implications. Addressing these issues will enhance the manuscript's clarity, rigor, and overall impact.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Onika Barkat</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia</p>