

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:

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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<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.	The manuscript discussing organizational ambidexterity in SMEs holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses a critical area of research that enhances understanding of how smaller enterprises can thrive in competitive environments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Perhaps it could be enhanced a bit more. For example: "Navigating Dual Pathways: Unveiling Exploration and Exploitation Strategies in SMEs through a Bibliometric Lens on Organizational Ambidexterity"	
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.	The abstract of the article provides a solid overview of the study's aims, design, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are several suggestions for enhancing its comprehensiveness: 1. Clarify the Research Significance: While the aims are stated, it would be beneficial to explicitly mention why understanding organizational ambidexterity in SMEs is important for both academic and practical applications. This could help underscore the relevance of the research. 2. Expand on Research Gaps: The abstract mentions notable gaps but could elaborate on specific implications of these gaps. For instance, discussing how addressing these gaps could impact SMEs' strategic decision-making or innovation processes would add depth. 3. Include Specific Findings: While the results section identifies trends and key contributors, it could be enhanced by including specific quantitative findings or metrics (e.g., percentage increases in research output) that highlight the significance of the trends observed. 4. Highlight Practical Applications: The conclusion emphasizes the need for comprehensive frameworks; however, providing a brief example of how SMEs might implement these frameworks in practice would make the conclusions more actionable. 5. Mention Future Research Directions: The abstract could benefit from a more explicit statement regarding future research directions beyond addressing underexplored areas. This could include potential methodologies or specific contexts for further investigation. Incorporating these suggestions would provide a clearer and more comprehensive view of the study's contributions and implications for both researchers and practitioners in the field of organizational ambidexterity in SMEs.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based upon the sources of references and the explanation made, scientifically, it should be on point.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references were around 5 years and few are from between 2015 to 2018. Overall, this manuscript used more of the latest data for the analytics done. It should be adequate since some of the historical data should be the foundation to which the newer findings were based upon.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The overall usage of English in the manuscript is actually very good. The flow and the words used were accurate in most of the paragraph. Yes, it should be adequate to the scholarly level.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract of the study on organizational ambidexterity in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) provides a structured overview of its aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. It highlights the significance of balancing exploration and exploitation strategies for SMEs to achieve competitive advantage and strategic sustainability. By employing bibliometric analysis, the study rigorously identifies trends and gaps in the existing literature, making it a valuable resource for understanding how SMEs can navigate dynamic business environments.</p> <p>While the abstract is effective, there are opportunities for enhancement. For instance, including specific quantitative findings, such as the percentage increase in publications or key metrics related to ambidexterity outcomes, would better engage readers and emphasize the study's contributions. Additionally, elaborating on the implications of identified research gaps—such as their potential impact on innovative practices—would make the conclusions more actionable for practitioners. A call to action for future research could also strengthen its relevance for both academic and industry audiences.</p> <p>The bibliometric analysis reveals a notable rise in publications on organizational ambidexterity since 2018, with a peak expected in 2024, reflecting an urgent need for exploration of ambidextrous strategies amid global disruptions. The study identifies key contributors from various countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom, China, and India, emphasizing how different contexts influence the implementation of these strategies. It categorizes research into three thematic clusters—Performance Outcomes and Managerial Implications, Strategic Processes and Theoretical Frameworks, and Methodological and Practical Contributions—while noting existing gaps related to dynamic capabilities. To address these gaps, the study recommends developing a comprehensive theoretical framework that integrates exploration, exploitation, and dynamic capabilities to guide both academic inquiry and practical applications in enhancing organizational resilience and sustainable business practices.</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>Rijal Abd Shukor</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur (IUKL), Malaysia</p>