



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1-Introduction You should be more explicit about the research issue, the research question(s) you are addressing. Is there a gap in the literature you have identified? Why this topic is important, interesting, for whom? You should also introduce the different parts of the paper and give its structure. 2-Literature review Literature review is too poor. Position clearly your paper in a research stream on competitiveness of the SME's. It means developing your analysis around the key works in this area. I would like to see more information about business environment, the overall perception of people about competitiveness and SMEs and after this to continue with CAD systems. Beside this, it will be good to compare some issues with the countries in neighbourhood to see whether those SMEs have the same characteristics and face the same barriers, In general, this section should be enriched with additional information	OK, same remarks as other reviewer. Other reviewer says the opposite



SDI Review Form 1.6

	which could increase its quality and improve its contents. 3-Conclusion Develop an introduction highlighting the contribution of your paper, the implications and the limitations. Also give some research perspectives for the future in this research stream.	
--	--	--