



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
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 STRUCTURE OF THE MANUSCRIPT: In this manuscript are missing key elements required in scientific work: - the purpose - lack of clearly formulated objective, so it is also difficult to settle the authors of its implementation, - the state of art - lack of the literature review in the field related to the topic, - the creative contribution - lack of literature review resulted in the lack of references to this, and then in the lack of possibilities to identify author's creative contribution. THE SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF THE MANUSCRIPT: The lack of defined purpose is unfavorable for the whole work, which takes the form of an essay more than a scientific article. Examples presented in the practical part are so varied thematically that completely not comparable with each other. General conclusion of the article leads to the finding that SMEs should use modern technologies including the simulations for supporting their decisions. This is undoubtedly true, but little revealing because the simulation has for years been known as a very flexible technique supporting decision-making process. Important question is - how to ensure SMEs such conditions as to be able to use of simulation and other decision support techniques ? And such question would be interesting practically and cognitively. It seems that in the second part of the article (section 3.2 Discussion) the authors understood it, because the first place there were taken by limitations of SMEs in terms of access to knowledge, technology and skilled personnel. In this perspective, the most interesting and having the creative	OK, done Not much other literature on this subject We have tried to give an answer See previous remark We have published papers on this subject but it is not on the scope of this paper (that we have rewritten to avoid this remark)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	potential is Section 3.3 - SMEs must have a clear strategy. There are proposals of alternative solutions in the field of SMEs competitiveness strategy. But there is a lack of theoretical and research bases that could show what is the creative contribution of authors. In summarizing the article review should be noted that the authors didn't use the potential of article subject. The article is very weak theoretically and has a little practical significance. It's really pity because the topic is important and very interesting.	No comment
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	TEXT EDITORIAL: Very bad impression is making by inattentive and incorrect text editing. Introduction and final conclusions are partly identical. List of references are not properly organized and not properly edited. In the text are not references to each item from the reference list. Besides these references are inconsistent - sometimes authors use the numbers (eg [5].), but sometimes use author's name (eg. [Kwassi, University of Reims Champagne-Ardenne, 2010]).	OK, we agree (done)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	SUMMARY OF REVIEW: Summarizing, the presented material has potential, but is not suitable for publication in its present form. It requires both substantive and editorial correction, including: - defining the purpose and directioning the text content onto its implementation, - referencing to the literature context and achievements of other researchers. Conclusions must refer to a defined purpose and certainly can not be repetition of opinions contained in the introduction. Such situation as it is now suggests that in the text is not anything interesting.	