



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_11571
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of the Concept (Ba) on Knowledge Management An Applied study in Cairo Amman Bank in Jordan
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) The study has very interesting and good ideas and has the potential to contribute. 2) However, in its current form there are endless problems with language, expression and writing style. 3) The title needs to be correctly stated. 4) Very often, key concepts and authors' names that are part of the sentence are put into brackets thereby making the sentence difficult to understand. 5) Parts of the literature review are repeated and appear again in the research methodology section. The methodological explanation is lacking. 6) The hypotheses are incorrectly worded and are sometimes not measureable in its current form. 7) The descriptive analyses must be redone. One cannot report item statistics (means, standard deviations). Instead, the descriptive statistics should have been computed per dimension rather than per item. Deeper support can be given by looking at item analysis (only where extremes are noted). Otherwise, the researcher engages in analysis paralysis. 8) Clear decisions should be reflected in terms of either accepting or rejecting the hypotheses. 9) Step-wise Multiple regression would prove to be more valuable than simple regression.	1. You say that the study is interesting and good is needed to give thanks and appreciation. Thank you for your comments. 2. I see that title correctly. Match up with the idea and the goal and the importance of research I cannot find justification to modify or change. 3. We took into consideration the subject of comment No. 4 Has been addressing the issue of names and some sources outside the sentences. 4. Surprising you say that the work of the hypotheses is incorrectly. It is also surprising to say that the hypothesis has not been measured. I've been measuring hypotheses and prove their validity or not according to tables 7-3 to 7-15 . 5. it is correct the multiple regression would prove to be more valuable than simple regression, but There are many studies used



SDI Review Form 1.6

		simple regression, and proved that he achieves good results especially this study finds of this kind more suitable to achieve results of the nature and scope of its application.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Perhaps, minor but the impact on the flow of reading is major – do not put things in brackets if they are part of the sentence.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study has potential to contribute but is largely impacted upon by the poor language, expression and writing style which must be corrected. Redoing the suggested statistics, although will involve more work, will add great value to the study.	