



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14510
Title of the Manuscript:	improving the competitiveness of the SME's using trade knowledge and simulation based design
Type of the Article	Opinion Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• The research methodology (experiment design) is not sufficiently described, so that research would be reproducible. Please specify better e.g. country of researched SMEs, NACE classification, how data were collected and other data description. • Fortify article with some structured hard data. • Last paragraph in chapter 2.3 should be deleted (instruction text).	OK, done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• English formulations are not always clear, e.g. "trade knowledge" is inaccurate expression in article context. Some biased statements are present. • Recommendation: supplement article with some relevant data tables, figures or charts, e.g. process diagram of optimal product innovation including customer (trade) knowledge, managerial economics analyses and simulation data. • Grant support acknowledgement is missing.	OK This point is far beyond the scope of the paper. We have written some precisions about this scope. It has been deleted by the editor, I presume
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article discusses interesting innovation and lean manufacturing topic with respect to SMEs. General reviewer opinion is characterized by following answers on leading questions: 1. Is provided sufficiently detailed and reproducible description of research methodology? No: Methodology description is underestimated. 2. Are data well controlled and robust? Partially: Some data are valuable, however tables or charts	OK, as reviewer 1 As reviewer 1



SDI Review Form 1.6

	quantitatively characterizing are missing. Data are mostly of case study type. 3. Are relevant and current references provided? Yes: work with references is adequate. 4. Are discussion and conclusions based on actual facts and figures and supported by data? Partially: The article is not based on strong figures. Discussion and conclusions are more of speculative kind than based on strong data. 5. Has appropriate statistical analyses been carried out? No: Statistical analysis is missing.	Even if the number of industrial cases is about 50, it is not relevant from our point of view to carry a statistical analyses
--	--	--