Knowledge Management for Sustainable Multidimensional Wealth: Reframing the MSW Model

Jose-Manuel Vega-Baez[1] and Berenice Juarez-Lopez[2]
[1]Tecnologico de Monterrey, Campus Laguna, School of Business, Torreon, Mexico
[2]Universidad Autonoma de Coahuila, Facultad de Economia y Mercadotecnia, Unidad Laguna, Torreon, Mexico

jmvegabaez@tec.mx
berenice.juarez@uadec.edu.mx

Abstract: This paper interprets the RMS Model, translated as Multidimensional Sustainable Wealth (MSW) Model, through a functional knowledge management (KM) architecture in order to clarify how multidimensional organisational wealth depends on knowledge-related capabilities. The paper is derived from a doctoral study that designed an integral business management model aimed at fostering Sustainable Multidimensional Wealth (MSW) in firms. That study followed a predominantly qualitative and exploratory orientation grounded in theoretical inquiry, documentary analysis, and interpretive-inductive reasoning, and resulted in the MSW Model, structured around five categories, ten subcategories, and forty-four emerging themes. Rather than treating MSW as a KM framework in origin, this paper argues that a functional KM lens provides a useful analytical vocabulary for interpreting selected MSW subcategories. Recent literature increasingly portrays KM as a field concerned with knowledge creation, sharing, integration, application, governance, and continuity, while also linking it to organisational learning, ESG integration, sustainability, and intellectual capital. Building on this literature, the paper maps five MSW subcategories — Corporate Culture, Corporate Talent, Corporate Intelligence, Corporate Governance, and Corporate Legacy — onto core KM functions. This mapping is used to explain how knowledge-related capabilities can support organisational outcomes that go beyond operational efficiency and extend to broader forms of value creation. The paper makes three contributions. First, it specifies a functional KM architecture and uses it as an analytical device for examining the MSW Model. Second, it shows that selected MSW subcategories can be interpreted as organisational loci through which KM functions are enacted, coordinated, and sustained. Third, it argues that MSW extends current KM debates by linking knowledge-related capabilities to multidimensional organisational wealth, particularly through continuity, legacy, and long-term viability. In doing so, the paper positions MSW as a structured interpretive framework that connects KM with organisational design and sustainable business management. It also suggests a pathway for future empirical research on how organisations may align knowledge processes with broader human, functional, contextual, economic, and transcendent dimensions of wealth.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Sustainable business management, MSW model, Organisational design, Multidimensional wealth

1. Introduction

Knowledge management (KM) has moved beyond repositories, codification systems, and information-processing routines. Recent research increasingly portrays it as a strategic and interdisciplinary field connected with organisational learning, decision-making, innovation, sustainability, and long-term value creation (Edwards and Lönnqvist, 2023; Durst, Edvardsson and Foli, 2023). Organisations therefore need managerial logics able to address ESG pressures, cultural fragmentation, technological change, and value creation beyond purely financial outcomes (Broccardo et al, 2025; Su et al, 2025).

The contemporary KM literature remains somewhat fragmented. Some studies focus on systems and analytics, others on learning culture, human resource practices, and knowledge sharing, and others on sustainability, intellectual capital, or governance. Fewer contributions offer a conceptual architecture that integrates these perspectives into a broader management model.

This paper addresses that gap by using a KM lens to reinterpret the MSW Model, originally developed in a doctoral thesis on business management for Sustainable Multidimensional Wealth (Vega-Baez, 2025). Although the thesis did not present MSW as a KM model, its architecture contains several components that can be interpreted through a knowledge management lens.

The paper addresses the following question: how can the MSW Model be interpreted through a functional knowledge management architecture, and what theoretical and managerial insights emerge from mapping its subcategories onto core KM functions? The paper develops an analytical reinterpretation rather than an empirical validation.

The paper makes three contributions. First, it specifies a functional KM architecture composed of knowledge creation, sharing, integration, application, governance, and continuity. Second, it shows that five MSW subcategories - Corporate Culture, Corporate Talent, Corporate Intelligence, Corporate Governance, and Corporate Legacy - can be interpreted as organisational loci through which these KM functions are enacted. Third, it argues that MSW extends KM debates by linking knowledge-related capabilities to multidimensional organisational wealth, continuity, and legacy.

The next section reviews recent literature on KM. The third explains the methodological positioning of the article. The fourth presents the MSW-KM mapping. The fifth discusses implications, limitations, and future research. The final section concludes.

2. Knowledge Management as an Integrative Organising Logic

Recent literature suggests that KM is best understood not merely as the management of information stocks, but as the orchestration of social, cognitive, strategic, and institutional processes that enable organisations to create, share, integrate, apply, govern, and preserve knowledge. Edwards and Lönnqvist (2023) call for a broadened research agenda, while Durst, Edvardsson and Foli (2023) show that KM research in SMEs increasingly spans leadership, strategy, culture, and capability development.

KM can also be approached through a functional architecture rather than as a generic umbrella concept. Recent work recurrently describes KM as a set of functions concerned with knowledge creation, sharing, integration or transfer, application, governance, and continuity over time (Edwards and Lönnqvist, 2023; Kowshik et al, 2025). This view preserves the conceptual autonomy of KM while making it compatible with adjacent domains such as learning, strategy, innovation, and sustainability (Khadir and Durst, 2025). In this paper, these functions are used to interpret MSW rather than to claim that MSW originated as a KM framework.

One important stream places social and cultural conditions at the centre of KM. Naqshbandi et al (2024) show that AMO-based HR practices and knowledge sharing contribute to a learning organisational culture. Meher et al (2025) link learning culture to organisational performance through KM and organisational intelligence, while Ahsan (2025) highlights the role of leadership in cultivating lifelong development. Together, these studies show that knowledge is shaped by values, routines, expectations, and leadership practices.

A second stream is particularly relevant because it links KM to ESG-related capabilities and sustainable performance. Recent studies show that KM contributes to sustainability by enabling collaboration, decision quality, strategic alignment, reporting capability, and the translation of environmental and social concerns into organisational action. This is visible in work connecting KM with ESG-oriented sustainability (Su et al, 2025), the integration of ESG practices into organisational strategy (Suciu et al, 2025), knowledge application for sustainable performance (Nguyen et al, 2025), green knowledge management and environmental culture (Baquero, 2025), and sustainability implementation through integration with other management domains (Broccardo et al, 2025). Related research on intellectual capital further suggests that ESG performance and competitive advantage increasingly depend on intangible and knowledge-based capabilities (Amitrano et al, 2025; Ahmad, Wu and Khattak, 2025).

A third stream relevant to this paper is the renewed interest in intellectual capital as a basis for value creation. Čabrilo, Užienė and Kianto (2025) argue that intellectual capital theory should evolve towards a more ecosystemic and socially responsive perspective. Likewise, Amitrano et al (2025) connect intellectual capital, ESG dimensions, and competitive advantage in SMEs, while Ahmad, Wu and Khattak (2025) show that green intellectual capital supports sustainability and sustainable business model innovation.

Recent ECKM contributions also reveal a strong interest in linking KM with adjacent managerial domains. Hidayat, Rosari and Sitalaksmi (2025) review knowledge-based HRM, Krawczyk (2025) examines KM in sustainability reporting, and Suciu et al (2025) address the role of KM in integrating ESG practices into organisational strategies.

Taken together, the literature suggests that KM is increasingly associated with organisational learning, culture, talent, sustainability, reporting, strategic alignment, and intellectual capital. Yet it still lacks sufficiently developed frameworks that bring these elements together into a unified management architecture. The MSW Model is relevant at this point because its multidimensional structure offers a way to organise these dispersed concerns into a coherent framework. The next section therefore interprets five MSW subcategories through a functional KM architecture centred on creation, sharing, integration, application, governance, and continuity.

3. Methodological Positioning and Analytical Scope

This article is a conceptual paper that develops an analytical reinterpretation of the MSW Model through a functional knowledge management (KM) lens. The MSW Model was originally proposed in a doctoral study entitled Diseño de un modelo de gestión empresarial para generar riqueza multidimensional sostenible (Vega-Baez, 2025). That study followed a qualitative and exploratory orientation based on theoretical inquiry, documentary analysis, and interpretive-inductive reasoning.

The present paper does not reproduce the doctoral thesis in abbreviated form, nor does it report new empirical findings. It does not draw on interviews, surveys, case studies, experiments, or intervention-based research conducted specifically for this article. Although the paper discusses managerial implications, it is not positioned as a Design Science study and does not claim to develop or validate an artefact.

Methodologically, the paper follows a theory-adaptation logic. It brings two conceptual domains into dialogue: the MSW Model as a framework for sustainable multidimensional wealth, and recent KM literature addressing knowledge creation, sharing, integration, application, governance, and continuity. The paper therefore operates as an analytical mapping exercise rather than as an empirical validation study.

The analysis proceeded in four steps. First, the core architecture of the MSW Model was identified from the doctoral thesis. Second, recent literature on KM, organisational learning, ESG and sustainability, and intellectual capital was reviewed. Third, five MSW subcategories were mapped onto core KM functions. Fourth, the implications of this mapping were discussed in theoretical and managerial terms.

This positioning preserves fidelity to the original logic of the MSW Model while allowing it to enter a new scholarly conversation in KM. The contribution lies not in prediction, causal testing, or artefact validation, but in conceptual clarification, theoretical integration, and the development of a structured interpretive framework for future empirical research.

4. Reframing the MSW Model Through a Functional Knowledge Management Architecture

4.1 MSW as a Multidimensional Management Architecture

The MSW Model was originally conceived as a response to the limitations of conventional business management models that privilege economic results and short-term efficiency. Its central proposition is that organisations should be designed to generate Sustainable Multidimensional Wealth across five major domains: economic, human, functional, contextual, and transcendent wealth (Vega-Baez, 2025). These domains are operationalised through ten subcategories, including Culture, Talent, Intelligence, Strategy, Governance, Ecology, Philanthropy, and Legacy.

From a KM perspective, the importance of this architecture lies in its refusal to isolate value creation in one dimension alone. Knowledge in organisations is not created or applied only to improve operational efficiency. It also shapes the quality of relationships, the formation of identity, the interpretation of environmental signals, the legitimacy of decisions, and the continuity of organisational meaning. In this sense, MSW can be interpreted as a multidimensional management framework whose selected subcategories are closely aligned with knowledge-related organisational capabilities.

This interpretation does not imply that every MSW component is reducible to KM. Rather, it means that KM provides a useful analytical vocabulary for understanding how the model's different dimensions interact. In particular, five subcategories create the strongest bridge between MSW and KM: Corporate Culture, Corporate Talent, Corporate Intelligence, Corporate Governance, and Corporate Legacy.

4.2 Mapping MSW onto a Functional KM Architecture

To make the paper's central argument more explicit, Table 1 maps five MSW subcategories onto a functional KM architecture. Rather than treating MSW as a KM framework in origin, the figure shows how key subcategories can be interpreted through six core KM functions: knowledge creation, knowledge sharing, knowledge integration, knowledge application, knowledge governance, and knowledge continuity.

Table 1: Interpreting the MSW Model Through a Functional Knowledge Management Architecture

MSW subcategories	Functional KM architecture	Organisational outcomes
Corporate Culture	Knowledge creation; Knowledge sharing; Knowledge continuity	Human wealth; Contextual wealth; Transcendent wealth
Corporate Talent	Knowledge creation; Knowledge sharing; Knowledge application	Human wealth; Functional wealth; Economic wealth
Corporate Intelligence	Knowledge integration; Knowledge application	Functional wealth; Economic wealth; Contextual wealth
Corporate Governance	Knowledge governance; Knowledge application; Knowledge continuity	Functional wealth; Contextual wealth; Long-term organisational viability
Corporate Legacy	Knowledge continuity; Knowledge sharing; Knowledge governance	Transcendent wealth; Contextual wealth; Long-term organisational viability

Table 1 maps five MSW subcategories onto six knowledge management functions and shows how these capabilities contribute to multidimensional organisational wealth and long-term viability, highlighting that the relationship between MSW and KM is one of analytical interpretation rather than conceptual substitution, since KM provides the vocabulary through which the organisational role of selected MSW subcategories can be clarified, and showing that knowledge-related capabilities contribute not only to operational efficiency but also to human, contextual, transcendent, and long-term outcomes.

4.3 Corporate Culture as a Condition for Knowledge Creation and Sharing

Recent literature consistently shows that organisational culture is not peripheral to KM; it is constitutive of it. Knowledge sharing, learning orientation, and collaborative sense-making depend on trust, norms, openness, and the willingness to engage in collective development (Naqshbandi et al, 2024; Meher et al, 2025). Within the MSW framework, Corporate Culture can therefore be interpreted as the social substrate that enables the movement from dispersed individual knowing to coordinated organisational learning.

Many KM initiatives fail not for technological reasons but because the organisation lacks a culture that supports knowledge exchange. In the MSW logic, culture contributes not only to human wealth but also to functional wealth through coordination, contextual wealth through stakeholder relationships, and transcendent wealth through shared meaning.

4.4 Corporate Talent as a Carrier of Tacit and Explicit Knowledge

A second key bridge is Corporate Talent. Knowledge does not exist apart from the people who embody, enact, adapt, and transmit it. Hidayat, Rosari and Sitalaksmi (2025) show that knowledge-based HRM has become an important research domain precisely because organisations must align people practices with knowledge creation and utilisation. Likewise, Ahsan (2025) highlights the role of leadership in fostering continuous development, while Naqshbandi et al (2024) connect HR practices with learning culture through knowledge sharing.

Within MSW, Corporate Talent can be interpreted as the organisational capacity to cultivate, mobilise, and renew human carriers of knowledge. This includes technical skills, interpretive capabilities, collaborative competence, commitment, and developmental readiness. From a KM perspective, talent is the medium through which tacit knowledge becomes socially useful and explicit knowledge becomes actionable.

This linkage is especially important because it prevents KM from being reduced to codified assets alone. Organisations generate long-term viability not only by documenting what they know, but by developing people who can reinterpret and apply knowledge under changing conditions. In this sense, talent is both a KM concern and a strategic management concern.

4.5 Corporate Intelligence as Knowledge Integration for Action

Corporate Intelligence is perhaps the most direct point of contact between MSW and KM. In the doctoral thesis, this subcategory refers to the organisation's capacity to observe, analyse, and understand internal and external realities in order to support strategic action (Vega-Baez, 2025). Interpreted through KM, Corporate Intelligence represents the process by which fragmented information is transformed into insight that can guide decision-making.

This interpretation resonates strongly with contemporary research. Meher et al (2025) connect KM with organisational intelligence, while Nguyen et al (2025) show that knowledge application contributes to sustainable performance. The implication is that knowledge becomes valuable when it informs action. It is not enough to collect information; organisations must integrate it, interpret it, prioritise it, and use it to shape responses.

Within the MSW framework, Corporate Intelligence links knowledge to multiple wealth dimensions. It supports economic wealth through better strategic decisions, functional wealth through improved coordination, contextual wealth through greater environmental awareness, and transcendent wealth through more coherent long-term orientation. It thus exemplifies the paper's core argument that KM is a multidimensional organising logic.

4.6 Corporate Governance as the Legitimisation and Prioritisation of Knowledge

A further contribution of the MSW interpretation is the recognition that knowledge has to be governed. Corporate Governance is often treated separately from KM, yet recent research on sustainability and strategy increasingly suggests that governance structures determine how information is prioritised, whose knowledge counts, and how decisions are made accountable (Broccardo et al, 2025; Suciu et al, 2025; Krawczyk, 2025).

In the MSW framework, Corporate Governance can be interpreted as the institutional arrangement through which knowledge is legitimised, prioritised, and translated into coordinated action. Governance shapes decision rights, attention, accountability, and continuity. Without governance, knowledge may remain available yet underused, contested, or disconnected from strategic action.

This is especially relevant in sustainability-related contexts. ESG integration, sustainability reporting, and long-term organisational viability all require governance mechanisms that ensure knowledge is not treated as episodic input but as part of an ongoing architecture of responsibility and sense-making. Interpreted in this way, governance becomes a KM issue because it determines the organisational conditions under which knowledge can influence action at scale.

4.7 Corporate Legacy as Organisational Memory and Long-Term Purpose

The most distinctive contribution of the MSW framework to KM may lie in Corporate Legacy. Much KM research focuses on creation, sharing, application, and retention. MSW adds a broader concern with continuity of identity, memory, meaning, and long-term purpose. In this respect, it extends the conversation from knowledge assets to organisational memory and enduring significance.

This extension aligns with recent work in intellectual capital and sustainability that calls for broader and more socially grounded understandings of value creation (Čabrilo, Užienė and Kianto, 2025; Amitrano et al, 2025). Legacy invites organisations to ask not only what they know and how they use it, but what they preserve, transmit, and stand for over time. It therefore adds a temporal and normative layer to KM.

In practical terms, Corporate Legacy includes institutional memory, identity narratives, accumulated experience, and continuity of purpose across generations of leaders, teams, and stakeholders. From a KM perspective, it expands retention from a technical concern into a strategic and cultural concern. From an MSW perspective, it contributes especially to transcendent and contextual wealth and reinforces long-term continuity.

5. Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Implications

This paper makes three theoretical contributions to current KM debates. First, it shows how a functional KM architecture can be used to interpret a multidimensional management model by mapping five MSW subcategories onto core KM functions. Second, it extends the conversation from knowledge processes to multidimensional organisational wealth. Third, it foregrounds continuity and legacy as underdeveloped dimensions of organisational knowledge.

The paper also contributes to theory by connecting KM with broader organisational outcomes without collapsing KM into adjacent domains. The MSW interpretation suggests that knowledge-related capabilities contribute simultaneously to human, functional, contextual, economic, and transcendent forms of value.

Finally, the paper advances KM theory by foregrounding continuity and legacy. While KM literature often addresses retention, the MSW lens broadens this discussion towards organisational memory, continuity of meaning, identity preservation, and long-term purpose.

5.2 Managerial Implications

The proposed mapping also generates practical implications for managers and organisational designers. It suggests that organisations should not treat KM as a separate programme limited to repositories, documentation, or technology platforms. Instead, managers can examine how knowledge-related capabilities are distributed across domains such as culture, talent, intelligence, governance, and legacy.

The model can also inform concrete managerial decisions. At the level of Corporate Culture, it directs attention to the social conditions that enable knowledge sharing and learning. At the level of Corporate Talent, it highlights the need to invest in people as carriers of tacit and explicit knowledge. At the level of Corporate Intelligence, it supports the formalisation of sensing, interpretation, and knowledge integration processes. At the level of Corporate Governance, it points to decision structures that legitimise and coordinate knowledge use. At the level of Corporate Legacy, it encourages organisations to treat continuity, memory, and purpose as strategic concerns.

The paper therefore offers an interpretive framework that managers may use to identify gaps between intended value creation and actual knowledge-related capabilities. It can guide architecture-level reflection on which processes, structures, and developmental priorities are required to align knowledge with multidimensional value creation.

5.3 Limitations

These contributions should be interpreted in light of the paper's limitations. This article is conceptual and does not provide empirical testing of the proposed mapping. It does not report case studies, interviews, surveys, or intervention-based research conducted specifically for this paper. Its contribution lies in conceptual clarification, analytical mapping, and theory adaptation.

5.4 Future Research Agenda

The analysis enables four directions for future research. First, scholars may empirically examine whether the proposed mapping between MSW subcategories and KM functions is observable across different organisational contexts. Second, future research may test whether certain KM functions are more strongly associated with specific dimensions of multidimensional wealth. Third, comparative work may explore how the MSW-KM relationship varies across sectors. Fourth, longitudinal research may examine whether organisations with stronger capabilities in knowledge governance and continuity develop greater resilience and long-term viability over time.

6. Conclusion

This paper has argued that the MSW Model can be more clearly understood when interpreted through a functional knowledge management architecture. Rather than subordinating KM to sustainability, the paper shows that KM provides a useful analytical vocabulary for explaining how selected MSW subcategories support multidimensional organisational wealth.

The main value of this reinterpretation lies in its integrative power. MSW brings together concerns often studied separately - culture, people, intelligence, governance, continuity, and long-term purpose - and invites a more holistic and human-centred understanding of KM. Organisations need more than efficient information systems; they need architectures capable of aligning knowledge with meaning, coordination, responsibility, and multidimensional wealth.

MSW should therefore be understood not as a final answer, but as a theoretically grounded platform for future research and practical experimentation.

Ethics Declaration: Ethical clearance was not required for this study because of the nature of the research.

AI Declaration: The structural editing of this paper was carried out by the authors. As non-native speakers of English, they used ChatGPT and Grammarly for translation, stylistic editing, and orthotypographic editing. The authors are fully responsible for the final text.

References

Ahmad, M., Wu, Q. and Khattak, M.S. (2025) "Linking green intellectual capital to sustainability and sustainable business model innovation in manufacturing SMEs: the role of green dynamic capability", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 139-184. doi: 10.1108/JIC-10-2024-0314.

Ahsan, M.J. (2025) "Cultivating a culture of learning: the role of leadership in fostering lifelong development", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 282-306. doi: 10.1108/TLO-03-2024-0099.

Amitrano, C.C., Gheith, M.H., Troise, C. and Cappa, F. (2025) "Individual and organizational intellectual capital, ESG dimensions and competitive advantage: a focus on Italian SMEs", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*. doi: 10.1108/JIC-12-2024-0411.

Baquero, A. (2025) "Transforming Organizational Readiness Into Green Innovation: The Crucial Roles of Green Knowledge Management and Environmental Culture", *Business Strategy and the Environment*, Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 6078-6094. doi: 10.1002/bse.4289.

Broccardo, L., Giordino, D., Yaqub, M.Z. and Alshibani, S.M. (2025) "Implementing sustainability: What role do knowledge management and management accounting play? Agenda for environmentally friendly businesses", *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 383-403. doi: 10.1002/csr.2936.

Čabrilo, S., Užienė, L. and Kianto, A. (2025) "Rethinking the Future of Intellectual Capital: Emerging Perspectives in IC Theory and Practice", in Kianto, A. and Toth, I. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 26th European Conference on Knowledge Management*, Reading, Academic Conferences International, pp. 166-172.

Durst, S., Edvardsson, I.R. and Foli, S. (2023) "Knowledge management in SMEs: a follow-up literature review", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 27, No. 11, pp. 25-58. doi: 10.1108/JKM-04-2022-0325.

Edwards, J. and Lönnqvist, A. (2023) "The future of knowledge management: an agenda for research and practice", *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 21, No. 5, pp. 909-916. doi: 10.1080/14778238.2023.2202509.

Hidayat, A.S., Rosari, R. and Sitalaksmi, S. (2025) "Knowledge-Based HRM: A Systematic Literature Review and Research Agenda", in Kianto, A. and Toth, I. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 26th European Conference on Knowledge Management*, Reading, Academic Conferences International, pp. 437-442.

Khadir, Y. and Durst, S. (2025) "What Knowledge Management is Not", in Kianto, A. and Toth, I. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 26th European Conference on Knowledge Management*, Reading, Academic Conferences International, pp. 507-513.

Kowshik, S.K.T.H., Abbas, J., Shahin, M., Akter, S. and Touw, W. (2025) "Knowledge transfer as a dynamic capability: a meta-analysis of its impact on organizational outcomes in international contexts", *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*. doi: 10.1080/14778238.2025.2519291.

Krawczyk, P. (2025) "Knowledge Management in the Context of Sustainability Reporting", in Kianto, A. and Toth, I. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 26th European Conference on Knowledge Management*, Reading, Academic Conferences International, pp. 544-552.

Meher, J.R., Mishra, R.K., Panigrahi, R.R., Patel, G. and Jena, L.K. (2025) "Does learning culture enhance organizational performance? A serial mediator with knowledge management and organizational intelligence", *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 107-118. doi: 10.1080/14778238.2023.2278729.

Naqshbandi, M.M., Meeran, S., Kim, M. and Mughal, F. (2024) "The role of AMO HR practices and knowledge sharing in developing a learning organizational culture: evidence from the United Kingdom", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 920-946. doi: 10.1108/JKM-01-2023-0032.

Nguyen, N.T.T., Nguyen, P.V., Vrontis, D. and Vo, N.T.T. (2025) "Enhancing organizational sustainable performance through green innovation: the roles of knowledge application, government policy, and green market orientation", *Journal of Knowledge Management*. doi: 10.1108/JKM-06-2024-0688.

Su, R., Mohapatra, A.K., Albishri, N., Liguori, R. and Stilo, P. (2025) "A knowledge management perspective on ESG 2.0 and policy implications toward corporate sustainability", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 29, No. 10, pp. 3281-3314. doi: 10.1108/JKM-02-2025-0159.

Suciu, M.C., Plesea, D.A., Petre, A. and Dumitrescu, D.O. (2025) "Exploring the Role of KM in Integrating ESG Practices into Organizational Strategies", in Kianto, A. and Toth, I. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 26th European Conference on Knowledge Management*, Reading, Academic Conferences International, pp. 973-980.

Vega-Baez, J.-M. (2025) *Diseño de un modelo de gestión empresarial para generar riqueza multidimensional sostenible*, Doctoral thesis, Universidad Iberoamericana Torreon, Mexico.