



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	This article can't be considered as review article because a review article must focus on a real and referenced problem then collect and gather as much as possible data and information then to organize them in a professional way. This paper missing all factors of review type article and doesn't provide any kind of novelty neither future reference. It's just provide some information about patent information and the Matheo patent software. The paper must be re-written from scratch by incorporating the following comments: - Structure must be clear - Problem must start from referenced problem or previous future work - Mention and describe a real case study - Reference list must be enhanced by adding journal articles and conferences - Review article must describes what's done before, current situation and perspective -	The rapid development of the number of patents (the worldpatent database contains more than 90 million notices) is a real information breakthrough since it opens the way to a better knowledge of the applications of the progress realized in Sciences. It gives also for the people curious of the development of the innovation trends an amount of information which is never published elsewhere except in patents. This situation should prompt the scientific research laboratories and more especially the academics to be conscious of this potential. (Most of the reasons are explain in the paper) It seems to me that the person who is concerned by the revision comments did not understand the key role that, in a world competition, patents may play not only to protect an invention or an idea, but also to generate new ideas and to give a vision of



SDI Review Form 1.6

		what can be done with an immaterial scientific knowledge. It also did not seems that this referee put in perspective the name in the journal where this paper is intended to be published and also that he did not perceive the key role of information in the development of Science and Technology. This is the reason why I will consider that it is not necessary to respond to this type of comments, unconstructive and out of the scope of the purpose of this work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issues-:If there are any ethical issues please clarify.	No ethical issues.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		