

Review of: "What Is in Organisation? Contents of a Self-Contained Container"

Prof. Ihab Sawalha¹

¹ American University of Madaba

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear author(s),

I believe you need to perform/incorporate several improvements to the paper before it is finally accepted. I have a number of comments:

1. The title of the paper is unclear and confusing. Please amend.
2. There are many speculative/judgmental/imprecise/unclear statements that need to be reconsidered, for instance:
 - a) The English language has a preference for pigeonholing concepts into one another - speculative/judgmental.
 - b) And as organizations appear capable of containing almost everything, it becomes clear why the organizations-as-container metaphor has acted as a "primary" or "root metaphor" of organization studies throughout the history of the field - imprecise/unclear.
 - c) How organizational space is an active presence rather than a passive container - imprecise/unclear.
 - d) Perspective reveals itself as a simple negative of its rejected counterpart - speculative/judgmental.
 - e) Orientation to solidity also plays out in practices of theorizing - imprecise/unclear.etc... Unfortunately, there are many other statements that lack clarity and precision.
3. The quality of English is lower than the expected level for an academic paper. The paper needs to be revised by a native writer/speaker or by language editing services. There are several language mistakes and poorly structured statements, for instance:
 - a) On the one hand,
 - b) If we are interested more specifically in what forms of communication are observed into one another, however, then..etc... and many others
4. The methodology is not clear. The whole argument is based on the author's own interpretations and comprehension of the academic literature and personal assessment. The methodology needs to be clarified.

5. The statement, "what is in organizations," is confusing. Kindly rewrite.
6. The contribution made by the paper is not clear/is not academically sound or proved. The author(s) need to clarify how the paper adds to the existing knowledge in a more academic style rather than leaning on his/their own interpretation of the extant literature.
7. The author could have used better and more academically accepted figures to demonstrate his points of view. Please reconsider the figures used.

Overall, I believe the paper needs extensive improvements before it is finally accepted for publication.