



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_14000
Title of the Manuscript:	Levelling the ground for innovation and regional development in developing countries through APA (Automatic Patent Analysis)
Type of the Article	Review 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 translation (I assume) of the article is littered with grammatical and spelling errors too numerous to list that need to be corrected before publication, and may have obscured my reading and interpretation of this article. - The main point of the article needs to be made clearer early on. I think the author(s) are trying to make the argument that less developed countries can benefit by adopting technologies invented in more developed countries (and hopefully, not by violating the intellectual property rights of the inventors), and this new database allows for planners to easily search for these new technologies based on the comparative advantages (particularly in natural resources) of the local economy. This could be accomplished either by reaching out to the inventors to attract foreign direct investment (FDI), or by licensing the new technology. By doing so, the technology "gap" may be closed. If that is what the author(s) were intending, I think it makes for a pretty strong paper. But, if the inventors could make money off of their discoveries already, what is currently impeding them from seeking out those opportunities. - If my interpretation is wrong, and the authors are arguing that the less developed countries need to engage in more R&D themselves (building on what can be found in the new database), they add more to the "how" of this can be useful (i.e., I would argue that less developed countries could better spend	There was no translations and the manuscript was directly written in English. The only problem is that there was a mistake in the version send to the editor. This has been corrected with the new revised manuscript. Two points must be considered. The first one which concerns the developing countries where most of the time the natural resources are sold without transformation or even without the necessary care during cropping, drying, storing... The APA provides insight to the stakeholders to understand what is done (as added value products) with their resources. On event if some used are protected, there is enough room to develop close products or (eg for instance with coconut fibers) or improvements. There is also the opportunity to use patents (or for China Utility models) which are not extended in the country and which have around two years of age, freely for internal use or for export in other countries (but not in the country from which the patent originates).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	their money elsewhere, such as infrastructure, that will lead to growth). For instance, I don't think that less developed countries should adopt (or try to compete) in developing more expensive energy solutions, as seems to be implied in the text citing to footnote 4. Lisuka's work (footnote 14) seems like a better solution. • Section 2 should be expanded upon. For instance, how much protection is afforded by each system? Are there different costs, or other rules, that would make patenting in one venue more appealing than others? Why patent everywhere? This would make interpreting the patent counts later in the paper more meaningful (i.e., does more patents in a country really reflect more inventive activity?). • The second example (moringa) doesn't add much to the paper. It should either be expanded on (for instance, how can Madagascar use this knowledge) or deleted.	The second point deals with research labs and research centers which got their financial support from the State. Most of the time the researchers develop their research either by replicating what is done in developed countries (for the developed countries) and for the developing countries they develop a research which aims to promote the researcher career and this is true for developed and developing countries. But, if those competences are not used to create products or services able to reach the market, most of these competences will be useless. To help the decision makers to promote new incentives in research or to help the researchers to shift part of their programs to useful developments, the APA can be considered as one of the best tools. Not true especially to detect new companies interested as well as to develop new uses of some part of the "Moringa".
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Define “SME” the first time it is used. The same for “WIPO” (it is defined the second time instead).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		