



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The article do not present the method used to develop the work. It should have a session dedicated to explain the method and why it fits on the research. By reading the article, it seems to be a multi-case study with inductive method for interpreting the data. I've recommend the author(s) to take a look at: - Flick, U. (2009). <i>An introduction to qualitative research</i>. Sage. - MERRIAM, S. B. (1998). <i>Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. Revised and Expanded from "Case Study Research in Education."</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. - Yin, R. K. (2014). <i>Case study research: Design and methods</i>. Sage publications. To state the methodological proceedings. "We consider SMEs whose core business is to manufacture products." This is not the definition of SMEs! Many Big and Huge companies manufacture products and cannot be considered SME.	Some remarks of this reviewer are at least curious ... There is a European definition of SMEs



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The authors should state what is SMEs and specified that for the scope of this work that are just dealing with SMEs that are part of the manufacture sector. “It is this second case that interests us. The first case that we have already processed [1] can be taken into account by a collaborative work based on appropriate” If the fist case it’s not part of the scope of this work why are you referring to it? What is the relevance of fist case for this work? What is the problem that the article deals with? Please provide the literature that point out the gap / problem. “SMEs, or even bigger firms, use numerical simulation very marginally.” Your scope if SME or Bigger Firms? Based on what the author(s) can state that they are marginally using numerical simulations? The article should pass thought an English proofing review. The author(s) present 3 cases 3.1.2 to 3.1.4 then 6 case types ... that are not directed related, the author(s) should state the text in a different way so that the readers to not make a misunderstanding of what the authors are refereeing to.	And our sentence tells exactly that ! Because it is important to give the context of the research (what we take into account and what we do not ...) OK see other reviewers Curious. OK OK
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please review the way of writing. i.e. Abstract: “Many SMEs, notably manufacturing ones, have long been <u>specializing</u> in manufacturing” I suggest to remove the “, notably manufacturing ones,” or write in a different way. “It is based on a inductive research, based on industrial cases.” Try to avoid being repetitive... Suggestion: All the acronyms should be stated i.e. SME (Small and Medium Enterprise) CAD, OEM, ETI...	OK
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The subject of the paper seems to be interesting, but should be address on a more scientific way. Presenting the problem of research (gap), objective(s), method used aligned with the objectives	