

Manuscript: “**Knowledge Sharing, Individualism, Collectivism, and Organizational Innovative Behaviour in Public Health Organizations**”

Submitted: 06 October 2021

Accepted: 29 December 2021

Published: 31 January 2022

Corresponding Author: **Khawaja Asif Tasneem**

Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n3p195

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Berenyi Laszlo

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Berenyi Laszlo

Once this review has been read, press "Confirm" to indicate that the review process may proceed. If the reviewer has submitted their review elsewhere, you may upload the file below and then press "Confirm" to proceed.

Completed: 2021-11-18 11:46 AM

Recommendation: Revisions Required

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*** The title is acceptable, it raises attention and covers the purpose of the presentation.**

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*** The abstract is acceptable. It is a comprehensive, general summary of the say that cover the relevant issues.**

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

A thorough grammar check is required; there are many mistyping, especially in using comas, word orders. Beyond this, the content is easy to understand, but improvements are needed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*** A thorough grammar check is required; there are many mistyping, especially in using comas, word orders. Beyond this, the content is easy to understand, but improvements are needed.**

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*** A thorough grammar check is required; there are many mistyping, especially in using comas, word orders. Beyond this, the content is easy to understand, but improvements are needed.**

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*** The conclusion includes the necessary items. The say of the paper is in the discussion section; conclusions give a summary.
Some limitations about Covid-19 may be considered as initial information for the analysis rather than a limitation.**

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*** The conclusion includes the necessary items. The say of the paper is in the discussion section; conclusions give a summary.
Some limitations about Covid-19 may be considered as initial information for the analysis rather than a limitation.**

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):