

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_82809
Title of the Manuscript:	STIB: THE SYSTEMIC THINKING INVENTORY FOR BUSINESS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljesbs.com/index.php/JESBS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Overall, the author should send the paper for proofreading before submission.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Title – Author is advised to redesign the title of paper. “Adoption of the systematic thinking inventory in Education Management”</p> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No introduction of abstract - No objectives - Methodology is unclear - No findings - No implication - The selected key words of the paper is irrelevant. The key words should be “divergent thinking, connected thinking, creative thinking, etc” <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction is too long. - It should be placed at different section paragraphs. - No problem statement stated in Introduction <p>Literature reviewing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Author should move the literature review from introduction. - No hypotheses development - No conceptual framework - No underlying theory <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall, the methodology is unclear. - No research procedure - No sample size justification - No sampling method - No discussion on the research site - No discussion on methodology used - What are the specific tests have been used in order to answer the proposed objectives. <p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No discussion on demographic profile. - The findings of EFA & CFA are not clearly discuss. - Author didn't discuss or describe the reasons of using certain test in the text. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Author didn't really discuss the result of analysis. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Author should summarise the objectives and results of the study followed by discussion on the managerial and theoretical implications. <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Author should ensure that all the used citations are listed in the reference lists. 	
--	---	--

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:	Winnie Wong Poh Ming
Department, University & Country	University of Technology Sarawak Sarawak, Malaysia