



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The research question should be clearly defined. 2. The authors spend too much time in describing Nonaka's theory. Probably, this is a consequence of a lack of KM theory, even if the authors examine various literature streams related to the topic in the literature review. I believe the authors should incorporate earlier literature of Knowledge Management into the paper. See Szulanski(1996).My recommend is to move away from a rather uncritical and unspecific discussion and to reframe the literature review trying to distinguish the unit of analysis in order to position your paper. 3. The authors confuse these two concepts: Ba and SECI model. There are four types of "Ba" and four types of knowledge conversion activities(SECI), but they cannot be brought into correspondence with each other. It is unconvincing to replace Ba with SECI model. In fact the paper focuses on the relationship between SECI and KM rather than Ba and KM activities. The measurement of KM, the independent variable, is also questionable due to lack of solid theoretical foundation. 4. Nevertheless, every single hypothesis is tried to be based on almost one theoretical background, but the logic behind the hypotheses is not always very persuasive. Some hypotheses would give more value to this research.	Thank you for your comments. 1 .The idea of study is new, so the reason behind the lack of intellectual and theoretical background. very few Previous studies indicate the ideas relationship of this issue, Study is one of the studies that contribute to the mind thinking in the KM . 2. Methodology and the idea of the Nonaka is content and entrance to approach SECI 've been referring to this justification in p.2 line. 18. And p. 5. Line. 5-6. With best regards
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper presents some interesting empirical material. It has however a set of rather serious shortcomings. In general, the paper would profit from being focused on a richer discussion of the literature review, and a clearer research framework. Also, the paper would benefit from the inclusion of a discussion section in which the authors could present theoretical and managerial implications of their research which are actually missing. This would help to convey the paper more coherence. The generalization of any findings outside of Arab context would then need to be addressed.	
---	---	--