



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_40008_A
Title of the Manuscript:	STRATEGIC AGILITY AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE: EXPLORATION OF THE ONTOLOGICAL, EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS
Type of the Article	Conceptual paper

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Authors use the term "our study" through out the paper . since it is a report that need to be written in third person. "Our" need to be replaced with third person equivalent 2. Conclusion – being a conceptual study, the conclusion can be little more elaborative, so that the contribution of the researchers become evident and seldf explanatory in nature	I admit the error in the use of the possessive "our" in the text. It was an unintentional mistake and has been duly corrected wherever it occurred in the text right from the abstract. Besides, your advice on the need to elaborate and expand sufficiently the conclusion to highlight the findings from the work was taken seriously and in good faith. The conclusion has been adjusted to accommodate this advice to the best of my knowledge and ability. I commend your vigilance and alertness.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		