Gmail **Hendryadi Hendryadi <hendry.basrah@gmail.com>**

197998922 (Cogent Social Sciences) A revise decision has been made on your submission

Cogent Social Sciences <em@editorialmanager.com> 27 Januari 2020 pukul 06.35
Balas Ke: Cogent Social Sciences <socialsciences@cogentoa.com>
Kepada: Hendryadi Hendryadi <hendry.basrah@gmail.com>

Ref: COGENTSOCSCI-2019-0436
197998922
Innovation Strategies for Low Technology Manufacturing SMEs: Organizational learning, imitating capability, and competitiveness
Cogent Social Sciences

Dear Hendryadi Hendryadi,

Your manuscript entitled "Innovation Strategies for Low Technology Manufacturing SMEs: Organizational learning, imitating capability, and competitiveness", which you submitted to Cogent Social Sciences, has now been reviewed.

The reviews, included at the bottom of the letter, indicate that your manuscript could be suitable for publication following revision. We hope that you will consider these suggestions, and revise your manuscript.

Please submit your revision by Feb 25, 2020, if you need additional time then please contact the Editorial Office.

To submit your revised manuscript please go to https://rp.cogentoa.com/dashboard/ and log in. You will see an option to Revise alongside your submission record.

If you are unsure how to submit your revision, please contact us on socialsciences@cogentoa.com

Please ensure that you include the following elements in your revised submission:
* public interest statement - a description of your paper of NO MORE THAN 150 words suitable for a non-specialist reader, highlighting/explaining anything which will be of interest to the general public (to find about more about how to write a good Public Interest Statement, and how it can benefit your research, you can take a look at this short article: http://explore.cogentoa.com/author-tool-kit/public-interest-statement)
* about the author - a short summary of NO MORE THAN 150 WORDS, detailing either your own or your group's key research activities, including a note on how the research reported in this paper relates to wider projects or issues.

You also have the option of including the following:
* photo of the author(s), including details of who is in the photograph - please note that we can only publish one photo
* cover image - you are able to create a cover page for your article by supplying an image for this purpose, or nominating a figure from your article. If you supply a new image, please obtain relevant permissions to reproduce the image if you do not own the copyright

If you require advice on language editing for your manuscript or assistance with arranging translation, please do consider using the Taylor & Francis Editing Services.
Please ensure that you clearly highlight changes made to your manuscript, as well as submitting a thorough response to reviewers.
We look forward to receiving your revised article.
Best wishes,
José Belso-Martinez, Phd
Editor
Cogent Social Sciences

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Conclusions – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

References – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Writing – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation
Reviewer 1: Sound

Comments to the author
Reviewer 1: SOUND

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Conclusions – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

References – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Not applicable

Writing – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation
Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Comments to the author
Reviewer 2: The paper deals with learning, imitating and competitiveness as an innovation strategy at SMS in Indonesia.
I think the most valuable contribution of the paper is that it tries to characterize Indonesian companies, but this is excluded from the title. It shouldn't.
Instead they try to make the main contribution the "originality" by saying that "This research is original in that it deliberately focuses on learning and imitating capability in low-technology SMEs, an area that has not seen significant research previously." I cannot agree with the authors as the Industrial Districts literature has been dealing with the innovation strategies of low-tech SME since the 1970's. See for instance Vega-Jurado, J., Gutiérrez-Gracia, A., & Fernández-de-Lucio, I. (2008). Analyzing the determinants of firm's absorptive capacity: beyond R&D. R&d Management, 38(4), 392-405 and Gabaldón-Estevan, D. & Ybarra, JA. (2017) Innovative culture in district innovation systems of European ceramics SMEs, European Planning Studies, 25(11), 2021-2036.
I believe you should make your case in the novelty of Indonesia rather than on the novelty of the area.
The authors should also use the Oslo Manual instead of proposing new definitions such as "The essence of innovation is basically a structured knowledge formalized into a new work through technical discoveries in the field." And also opinions such as "Each employee must develop values that emphasize shared vision to create personal commitment, a system of thinking that focuses on cause and effect relationships and sees systematic problems far ahead". I think is far too normative.
I also think that the following definition is not appropriate for this field of research: "Imitating capability is a cognitive process to take actions by involving the senses as recipients of stimuli and the installation of perceptual ability to process information from stimuli with the acting ability to perform motoric skills (Bandura, 1977)."
Also is not clear the expression: "rom pure clones, to fully immitate existing products"
In methods is not clear what is causing what, as data is not longitudinal.
Another important final point is the lack of consistency in citing:
- Sometimes publications by three authors are cited in the text in full (the three authors surnames) sometimes not. (See for instance Naranjo-Valencia et al., 2011 vs Yamamura, Sonobe, & Otsuka, 2005, but there are many more like Kang et al. 2007;). Even sometimes of two authors only one is cited Argyris, 1978.
- There are many references cited that are not in the reference list: Amir, 2014; Skerlavaj, et al., 2010; Chang, 2008; Porter, 1985; Kogut and Zander (1992); Dodgsonet, et al. (2006); Takácsné György and Toyserkani, 2014; Jerez-Gomez et al 2011; Ringle et al., 2014; Kogut and Zander, 1992; Dodgsonet, et al.,2006;
- And there are some references in the reference list that have not been cited: Darroch, J. and McNaughton, R. (2002); ulmer, R.M., P. Gibbs and B. Keys. (1998).; Frank, H., Kessler, A., Mitterer, G. and Weismeier-Sammer, D. (2012),; Hurley, R.F., Hult, G.T.M. and Knight, G.A. (2003),; Kerin, R.A., Varadarajan, P.R. and Peterson, R.A. (1992); Murat Ar, I., & Baki, B. (2011).; am, S., & Gray, D. E. (2016)

Dear Authors

When resubmitting, a careful editing of the paper (including references) seems necessary.
