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Reviewer's report:

The authors are to be commended for having undertaken the proposed revisions. The following are essential revisions in order to clarify concepts within the paper. The use of specific examples throughout the paper is effective.

One major concern is related to the number of frameworks presented. The last three frameworks are presented and discussed in a superficial manner. I would recommend that they be mentioned and referenced but not elaborated upon.

p. 11 1st par. Describe briefly what criteria were used to select the frameworks. Why was there difficulty in reaching consensus with frameworks which were left out? Would some readers raise the same issues. It may be better to address concerns.

p. 11 The Crossan “4i” framework is included in Figure 1 as a “sub” framework of Schon’s framework. This approach was quite confusing though it was explained in the text it’s unclear why it is not presented on its own.

Table 1 requires that references be added so that the reader can easily find these frameworks.

Table 1: under organizational knowledge creation i would suggest that the learning process more clearly speak to Nonaka’s concept of the conversion process between different types of knowledge i.e. tacit to explicit.

Under TQM it might be argued that it is the practitioners who create new knowledge.

p. 16 1st par. last sentence. The latter part of this sentence contradicts the first part. If the organizational culture does not support learning why would one want to align activities with it?

p. 18 Effective TQM processes have generally been focuses on double-loop learning.

1st par. last sentence I’m not sure whether the literature review does accomplish what is stated.

pp.19-20 The ELO model as presented does not seem to make sense. You need to explain how it was derived. I would have thought that the sequence would be learning (actually is a broader construct) –interpreting- relating – deciding. I’m assuming it refers to learning processes as contrasted with “learning organization”

p. 21 – I wonder whether Figure 1 should be a summary of effective application
of concepts. One could use the scenario and expand on what is described on p. 24. The Figure would then summarize conditions for effective learning.

Table 2 – The screening questions would be unnecessary if the above were carried out. Introducing “communities of practice” in this T. when it has been briefly mentioned will confuse the reader.
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