

**Peer review report on
Measurement of Maturity of Knowledge Management in an organization**

I have gone through the first 2 chapters completely. My opinion on the paper is, but for some English issues, the overall quality of the paper is very good. The document is enriched with information. However, a major reorganization of the chapter contents is required to make it more professional. The following are my comments on first 2 chapters

Comments on Chapter 1

Regarding the structure of Chapter 1, I would suggest the chapter 1 to be reorganized as per the below given structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Research Background
- 1.3 Problem statement/definition
- 1.4 Aim of the study
- 1.5 Objectives of the study
- 1.6 Research Questions
- 1.7 Significance/Purpose of the research
- 1.8 Scope/Limitations of the research.
- 1.9 Definition of key terminologies
- 1.10 Organization of the thesis
- 1.11 Chapter Summary

Issues in the present chapter 1

In general, the introduction chapter will give valid reasons behind doing a research, elaborate the research purpose/significance, present the research problem along with the aims, objectives, research questions, objectives and limitations. However, I feel that the present Introduction chapter has too much of theory and lacks proper justification for conducting this research. I would recommend the researcher to include the sections 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8,

and 1.10 as given above [I could see the problem statement and research goals in chapter 3. However, I would recommend the researcher to move them to Chapter 1]. Further an Introduction chapter must present the readers with statistical data/facts and figures to justify the purpose of the research. This dissertation lacks it.

The following are my comments on the contents of individual sections of Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction

Please make it a small paragraph on what this chapter is going to convey.

1.2 Research Background.

Please move the present contents of 1.1 under this section (*From Business today is highly knowledge intensive till an “Overall KM Maturity Score” of an organisation*). Further please add facts and figures in form of graphs and tables inside the research background rather than adding theory alone. For instance the impact of not measuring knowledge management maturity can be given with the help of examples of statistical data.

In the research background section, we can introduce a small subheading by name, Background of the company since we are following a case study approach here. Had it been a general research where 4-5 organizations are studied together, this section would not have been necessary. However, since we are going to discuss about Larsen and Tourbo as a major part of research, I would suggest the researcher to give a background of KM at L and T. (Even though a survey has been conducted with 63 different organizations, a major portion of data analysis is on L and T. So I feel that a mention on L and T's KM has to be given in the Introduction chapter.)

Section 1.2 and 1.3 in the present dissertation seem to be definitions with an elaborate detail on Knowledge classification methods and evaluation methods. I would suggest these things to be taken to the 2nd chapter. Rather the research background section could be elaborated to compensate the word count. Further as per the structure given above a new section (*1.9 Definition of key terminologies*) could be introduced where in brief definitions (2-3 lines) of Knowledge, KM, KMS, tacit knowledge, explicit knowledge, codified knowledge, non-

codified knowledge could be given. Also so many definitions on all these terminologies is not necessary since our key focus is on measurement of maturity of KM.

Comments on Chapter 2

Chapter 2 is very well-written with so many relevant sources reviewed in it. Only minor revisions are required in terms of Chapter 2. I would suggest the following structure for chapter 2.

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Knowledge

2.3 Knowledge management

2.4 Knowledge management maturity

2.5 Measurements of KM process

2.6 Research Gap

2.7 Research Hypotheses

2.8 Chapter Summary

Issues in the present chapter 2

The sections 1.2 and 1.3 of present Introduction chapter could be moved to the 2nd chapter (Section 2.2 and 2.3 respectively). The contents of section 2.2 and 2.3 can remain as it is. In the review of literature it is important to introduce a section, Research Gap at the end where we have to discuss the gap identified in the literature [I would recommend the writer to move section 3.3 in the present thesis at the end of the LR chapter]. Also since this study uses a quantitative approach as well, it is important to mention the research hypotheses that are to be tested in the ROL chapter. Another issue with the present LR chapter is referencing. In a LR chapter, it is important that each and every valid statement we give should be referenced. Even though the researcher has done a critical review of many secondary sources in many parts of the LR chapter,

there is a complete lack of referencing in some sections. For instance, in sections 2.3.1 (*Why measure knowledge and KM?*) and 2.3.2 (*What could be measured?*) there is not even a single reference. This has to be addressed. The same applies to sections 2.3.4, 2.3.5 and 2.3.6 as well.