



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_13714
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of information and coordination innovation on relationship and firm performance: The case of small and medium enterprises in Indonesia
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:

(<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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The background of the study does not indicate the knowledge gap and does not bring about all issues which build to the study. 2. The context of the study is SMEs, need to justify and give statistics and the main issues. 3. Literature review section inadequately done, need to critically review literature on information sharing, coordination innovation, relationship performance, firm performance and importantly address the relationships between the study variables. 4. Theoretical framework to proceed conceptual frame work and focus on the variables of the study. 5. The theoretical anchorage of the study RBV to be linked to the study and the main issues discussed. 6. Methodology section to show the design, population and their justification. 7. Explain the measures of al the study variables. 8. Interpretation of the results and the discussion of the findings not done at all. 9. The conclusion given does not reflect the findings of the study. 10. Reference list not reflective of the citations in the body. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Topic phraseology does not mirror the work, 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>conceptual framework of the study, need to understand the role of each variable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. To many typographic errors from the abstract to the end of the article eg line 28, 67, 122, 192 etc3. Study need to indicate the significance in terms of theory, policy and practice.4. Define important variables like information, relationship performance and firm performance.5. The article does not have recommendations.6. Line 32 and 33 use the right method when citing same authors with different articles during same year.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Rearrange the sub sections for logical flow.	The logical flow has been rearranged.