

16-Dec-2017

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Your manuscript entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in the Competitiveness Review.

Your manuscript ID is CR-12-2017-0090.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Centre after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev>.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision or send directly to Emerald if your paper is accepted immediately. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review.

Yours sincerely,
Competitiveness Review Assistant Editor

28-Jan-2018

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Manuscript ID CR-12-2017-0090 entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" which you submitted to the Competitiveness Review, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

Please update for recent literature, if necessary, including recent Competitiveness Review articles and forthcoming articles (posted online in pre-publication format). Your literature review does not need to be exhaustive but should be up to date.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and

enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Competitiveness Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. The manuscript should be submitted within two months. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision within the two months deadline, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please send these to Emerald as soon as possible. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Philippe Gugler
Editor, Competitiveness Review
philippe.gugler@unifr.ch

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:
Over all this was an interesting read, thanks for your research contributions.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: This research does provide a different perspective to SMEs competition with the use of innovation as a mediator.

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?: The references that have been cited are adequate in both content for this research, however there is a small number of current research used. ,

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?: The methodology is good, however could be explained more distinctly with the use of key paragraphs moved from discussion session.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The discussion section is too long and needs to be broken down for readability, the conclusion is good

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Interesting---- Indications that food SMEs in Great Malang seeks to create barriers to entry for other businesses through efforts to control key success factors as well as the speed of government approval. Although the mention of 8 interviews is interesting for the reader, it should not be highlighted unless there is data or collection methodology discussed.

6. 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.: There are minor revision that needed in grammar and spacing as well as in the citations. For example quotes should not be used in this and similar references
Baregheh, A., Rowley, J., Sambrook, S., and Davies, D. (2012), "Food Sector SMEs and Innovation Types", British Food Journal, Vol. 114 No. 11, pp. 1640 – 1653.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

Congratulation

This is a good paper, but I think the paper can be better if the author provides the novelty and uniqueness of the paper by showing it in graphical table comparing similarities and differences among previous literature. There is only small section in the paper mentioning about the interview method that need more explanation how it was being used including how is the coding that lead to the findings. Besides that, the author must emphasize in findings that how the creative destruction is partially mediate innovation speed and competitiveness of food SMEs. In overall, this paper will lead to a significant contribution for the future researcher.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The idea of creative destruction as mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness is interesting. It would be better if there is a table and explanation about the novelty of this paper compared to previous research on creative destruction.

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?: The author provides relevant literature such as definitions and indicators of related variables. However, the literature review did not explain the uniqueness of this paper compared to previous studies.

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?: The paper is built on appropriate base of theory and concepts by using variables and indicators from some previous studies. The methods are appropriate. However, interview is not mentioned in methodology section, while the author explained about interview results in discussion section. It would be better if interview methods and coding results also explain in methodology section. In addition to that, if the author uses the semi structure interview methods, the author also need to describe the mix methods quan-qual are used in this paper as the methods framework.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are analysed appropriately in findings and discussion sections. However, the findings section needs more description on how it can be concluded that creative destruction is partially mediate innovation speed and competitiveness of food SMEs.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The study provides good academic and practical contribution. There is an adequate explanation about practical contribution, especially for government and SMEs. The implications are

consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper.

6. 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.: The author provides a good explanation about creative destruction as mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness. The language is quite easy to understand. I think it would be better if the author can provide "table" comparing similarities and differences among previous literatures.

16-Mar-2018

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Recently, you received a decision on Manuscript ID CR-12-2017-0090, entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia." The manuscript and decision letter are located in your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev>

This e-mail is simply a reminder that your revision is due on 30-Mar-2018.

Please click the link to create a revision: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev?URL_MASK=a3f0dfbfe6ec4d0a97aa03d3bb6bc820

If you need extra time, please contact me to discuss an extension. (Please quote your manuscript ID). If you do not request an extension and you miss the deadline, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Philippe Gugler
Editor, Competitiveness Review

21-Mar-2018

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Your revised manuscript entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in the Competitiveness Review.

Your manuscript ID is CR-12-2017-0090.R1.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the

office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Centre after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev>

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision or send directly to Emerald if your paper is accepted immediately. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review.

Yours sincerely,
Competitiveness Review Assistant Editor

30-May-2018

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Manuscript ID CR-12-2017-0090.R1 entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" which you submitted to the Competitiveness Review, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

Please update for recent literature, if necessary, including recent Competitiveness Review articles and forthcoming articles (posted online in pre-publication format). Your literature review does not need to be exhaustive but should be up to date.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised

manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Competitiveness Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Philippe Gugler
Editor, Competitiveness Review
philippe.gugler@unifr.ch

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Reject

Comments:

The suggested revisions were not addressed adequately.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: This research does provide a different perspective to SMEs competition with the use of innovation as a mediator.
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?: The references that have been cited are adequate in both content for this research.
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?: This was not addressed: The methodology is good, however could be explained more distinctly with the use of key paragraphs moved from discussion session.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: There is clarity that is need to understand how the data was solicited and
5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Was not addressed--- The mention of 8 interviews is interesting for the reader, it should not be highlighted unless there is data or collection methodology discussed.

6. 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.: This was not addressed: the mention of 8 interviews is interesting for the reader, it should not be highlighted unless there is data or collection methodology discussed.

Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

This research is interesting and gives contribution to research on innovation. The idea of creative destruction as mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness is interesting. However, it still needs some revision in several areas such as literature review and results/analysis.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The idea of creative destruction as mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness is interesting. It would be better if there is a table and explanation about the originality of this paper compared to previous research on creative destruction.
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?: The author provided relevant literature such as definitions and indicators of related variables. However, the literature review did not explain the uniqueness of this paper compared to previous studies.
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?: The paper is built on appropriate base of theory and concepts by using variables and indicators from some previous studies. The methods are appropriate. However, interview is not mentioned in methodology section, while the author explained about interview results in discussion section. It would be better if interview also explained in methodology section.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results are analysed appropriately in findings and discussion sections. However, the findings section needs more description on how it can be concluded that creative destruction is partially mediate innovation speed and competitiveness of food SMEs.
5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The study provides good academic and practical contribution. There is adequate explanation about practical contribution, especially for government and SMEs. The implications are consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper.

6. 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.: The author provides a good explanation about creative destruction as mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness. The language is quite easy to understand. I think it would be better if the author can provide "table" comparing similarities and differences among previous literature.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Minor Revision

Comments:

The theme of the paper is interesting, but it is also complex. In the methodology of the abstract must be referred the method, structural equations.

The literature review should be improved, be more consistent. there are some basic references about creative destruction that are not mentioned in the paper.

Reference error: Albernathy and Clark, 1985 is Abernathy and Clark, 1985.

The conclusions should be further and more detailed.

There should be a comparison of the results obtained in this paper with the results of studies presented in the literature review.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The theme of the paper is interesting, but it is also complex.

In the methodology of the abstract must be referred the method, structural equations.

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?: The literature review should be improved, be more consistent. there are some basic references about creative destruction that are not mentioned in the paper.

Reference error: Albernathy and Clark, 1985 is Abernathy and Clark, 1985.

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?: Yes

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The conclusions should be further and more detailed.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: There should be a comparison of the results obtained in this paper with the results of studies presented in the literature review.

There should be a comparison of the results obtained in this paper with the results of studies presented in the literature review.

6. 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.: I think the meaning of "mediating role" should be clearer.

16-Jul-2018

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Recently, you received a decision on Manuscript ID CR-12-2017-0090.R1, entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia." The manuscript and decision letter are located in your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev>

This e-mail is simply a reminder that your revision is due on 30-Jul-2018.

Please click the link to create a revision: *** PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. ***

https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev?URL_MASK=ac95d1bb34384e86a9dfbdd423e80a95

If you need extra time, please contact me to discuss an extension. (Please quote your manuscript ID). If you do not request an extension and you miss the deadline, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Philippe Gugler
Editor, Competitiveness Review

23-Jul-2018

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Your revised manuscript entitled "Creative Destruction as the mediation between innovation speed and competitiveness of food small and medium-sized enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in the Competitiveness Review.

Your manuscript ID is CR-12-2017-0090.R2.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Centre

after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev>

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision or send directly to Emerald if your paper is accepted immediately. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review.

Yours sincerely,
Competitiveness Review Assistant Editor

14-Mar-2019

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Your manuscript entitled "Creative Destruction as the Mediation between Innovation Speed and Competitiveness of Food Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in the Competitiveness Review.

Your manuscript ID is CR-12-2017-0090.R3.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to ScholarOne Manuscripts at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Centre after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev>.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision or send directly to Emerald if your paper is accepted immediately. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Open Access?

All of our subscription journals give you the option of publishing your article open access, following payment of an article processing charge (APC). To find the APC for your journal, please refer to the APC price list: http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/openaccess/apc_price_list.pdf

Emerald has established partnerships with national consortium bodies to offer a number of APC vouchers for eligible regions and institutions. To check your eligibility please refer to the open access partnerships page: <http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/openaccess/oapartnerships.htm>

If you would like to publish your article open access please

contact openaccess@emeraldgroup.com

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review.

Yours sincerely,
Competitiveness Review Assistant Editor

15-Apr-2019

Dear Dr. Yufra,

Manuscript ID CR-12-2017-0090.R3 entitled "Creative Destruction as the Mediation between Innovation Speed and Competitiveness of Food Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises in Malang, Indonesia" which you submitted to the Competitiveness Review, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

Please update for recent literature, if necessary, including recent Competitiveness Review articles and forthcoming articles (posted online in pre-publication format). Your literature review does not need to be exhaustive but should be up to date.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/comprev> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to the Competitiveness Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as

possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please upload these when you submit your revision. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to the Competitiveness Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Philippe Gugler
Editor, Competitiveness Review
philippe.gugler@unifr.ch

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Major Revision

Comments:

It was unclear where the paper progressed. The methodological points were not clarified.

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Needs to make clear how the interviews were analyzed to help this support the findings. It was not clear what revisions were made

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 is possible to bring more recent studies in the field of competitiveness.

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?: How many companies were considered? First presenting are 171 and then 161, it is need to review that point. Clarify how the interviews were used and analyzed for triangulation with the quantitative results. Not is clear as the interviews were useful.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results were partially clear, some sections were not related to the literature used.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in

research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The text could more clarify the implications of the study.

6. 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.: It is needs a general revision. Or justify why keeping the text as it stands.