



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15670
Title of the Manuscript:	On the effect of technological gap on international patenting: a multi-criteria approach
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	1. In section 3, the equation 1 has been presented, but the forms was mixed up. Please enter correct ones again.	I corrected it.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the conclusions part, if we take a high ranking country and a low ranking country into consideration, what the results will be in your method that you mentioned?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. According to this paper, three criteria are main variables which can affect the country's technological progress. Are there any other variables should we take into consideration? If yes, please express them; if no, please describe the reasons.	There are potentially more variables that could be included but we chose to use the variables proposed by the greatest part of the literature. Other variables like the "number of researchers" for example, are highly correlated with the three variables that we use.