



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_15533
Title of the Manuscript:	MEASURING INNOVATION CULTURE: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A MULTIDIMENSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE
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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>a) This was an interesting research and I wish to commend the authors for their hard work.</p> <p>b) The article mentions to the three issues in innovation culture and discusses this. More discussion needs to be presented on why only three issues were considered in the paper.</p> <p>c) The literature review could have been comprehensive. The study does not seem to list the contributions it will make for academics and practitioners. More specific discussion on this would have been nice</p> <p>d) Also it is not clear if the authors developed the questionnaire or used an existing scale. Authors have presented the questionnaire in the Appendix section and this was good</p>	<p>Thank you very much</p> <p>The issue of innovation culture is very complex. It is impossible to deal with all of this complexity in a paper. We focused on the issues more relevant to the purpose of our research. Anyway, we tried to clarify this in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>We appreciate your opinion. We considered it complete enough, but of course there is room for improvement and we will consider it in future works. We have included a reference to this question in the conclusion in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>We have made it clearer in the revised manuscript. Thank you very much for your interest in the questionnaire and the valuation of its inclusion in the appendix.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>to see</p> <p>e) It was good to see that specific limitations of the article were clearly discussed in addition to a clear discussion of results</p> <p>f) Overall I found the study to be methodologically very sound</p>	Thank you very much
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The article can use a stronger editing from a grammatical standpoint.	Corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall a good and timely article!	We are very grateful for your comments and inputs.