



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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Modification of the text in the “Abstract”: <i>Purpose, Design/methodology/approach, Practical implications and Originality/value.</i> <i>Example:</i> <i>“Acknowledging the essential role of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) for empirical evidences economic growth indicates that networking among SMEs with business partners becomes a determinant factor for improving growth”.</i> <i>OR “The coordination capability among channel members in distribution channel for instance”.</i></p> <p>2. The language of the paper needs a careful editing for the international audience (IT IS NOT AN OPTION – The author has to put the paper in the correct and clear english language).</p> <p>3. In the section “introduction”: becomesthe?</p> <p>4. In the section “introduction”: What is two-way Communication? Author describes what it is; remember that the reader must understand your idea at first time.</p> <p>5. Remember that the section “Introduction”: Provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work done. AS a full text.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>6. In the section “Literature Review and Conceptual Framework”: MUST BE RECOUNT to title number 2, and so on with another title in the entire paper.</p> <p>7. In the section “Literature Review and Conceptual Framework”: hada.</p> <p>8. In the section “Literature Review and Conceptual Framework”: 1.2 Conceptual Framework 2.2.1 Information and Coordination Innovation on Performance.</p> <p>9. In the section “Literature Review and Conceptual Framework”: What is the difference of: Theory Background, Literature Review and Conceptual Framework?</p> <p>10. In the section “Literature Review and Conceptual Framework”: Figure.1 Conceptual framework – this figure Express the Idea of you framework. Put your insights and the most valeu concepts that you cited on your Theory Background or Literature Review or Conceptual Framework on this figure.</p> <p>11. In the section “Research Methodology”: 2. Research Methodology 3.1 Data Collection</p> <p>12. In the section “Research Methodology”: Determiningthe</p> <p>13. In the section “Research Methodology”: Thenumber.</p> <p>14. In the section “Research Methodology”: the primary data shows that more</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>than 50% is small business; it could lead your conclusions into wrong direction. This sample not conducted to the SME generally.</p> <p>15. In the section “Research Methodology”: Nonetheless, most of them were engaged in trading. Describe what is engaged in trading?</p> <p>16. In the section “Research Methodology”: The author described a linear Cronbach’s alpha measures, because it is easy to conduct a study to prove the rationality index of 100%, be carefully with this 0-1 rationally. But , only use the variables: Information sharing and coordination, innovation in lending, Relationship performance and Firm performance with 5 (five) point likert scale. Of course, the alpha coefficient was 0.7 values, because the sample varies in 5 points. The same analysis to values of kurtosis and skewness.</p> <p>16. In the section “Research Methodology”: The author has to use the test of hypothesis. To analyze the impact of information and coordination innovation on relationship and firm performance.</p> <p>16. In the section “Research Methodology”: result of the fitness?</p> <p>17. In the section “4.3 Findings”: if the p-value of the significance level is less or equal to 0,01 shows that the sample is inconsistent with the assumption of “information and coordination innovation on relationship and firm performance”.</p> <p>18. In the section “4. Conclusion”: could be developed further to highlight the unique contributions of the paper, implications for theory and practice, limitations of the research and directions for future research in detail.</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: No.</p> <p>2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: It a start needs a little further develop see comments to author already described.</p> <p>3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Conceptual paper therefore the need to strengthen the literature review. Need clarify the Methodology.</p> <p>4. Results: Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: No</p> <p>5. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil