



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_31399
Title of the Manuscript:	APPROACH TO ASSESS AND SELECT SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (SMEs) FOR INCUBATION ON THE BASE OF ANGEL MODEL – a case on developing economies, the (ENGINE) program
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	- A significant editing would need to be made throughout the paper since there are many spelling/language mistakes. For example, in line 87 the paper mentions "this study discover" while it should be "this study discovers". Similar mistakes are repeated quite often within the manuscript. - In lines 70-71 it is mentioned "This process of selecting SMEs for incubation has many flaws, prone to biases and in most cases leaves the most promising SMEs out of the competition.". I find this language very strong and would suggest rephrasing. Are there any evidence that the promising SMEs are left out of the competition? Has there been any assessment? On which evidence is this statement based? - This comment also applies on this sentence in lines 97-98: "but not their skills in developing successful business plan". - I would suggest to avoid very strong language such as in line 147: "have proved clearly that". The same comment applies for lines 196-197. I would strongly suggest using more scientific language instead of expressions such as "it is a complete mistake". Lines 380-390 explain the collection of data from the interviews. Has there been any validation of this data and if yes how? Validation should be clearly explained in this session.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- I am not sure what is the reference style required by the journal. In some parts of the paper I see this style: "Carroll and Hannan (2000)", while in others this one: [19,33]. Reverences should be consistent. - I would recommend to avoid using first person within the paper, like for example in line 28 where it is mentioned "I identified the index". In my view it would be better to use	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	language such as "this paper identifies an index", or this "study identifies" etc. - In lines 128-130 it is mentioned: "If economists and scholars claim that small and medium enterprises are the backbone of the economy, how come they don't have a universal definition of SME, and a well-accepted model that allows for gauging the success of SMEs?" This is a good point but I am not sure if realistically such a definition could be agreed at the global level. - In lines 134-136 it is mentioned that "none of the literatures reviewed by this study did mention that a business plan can be used to determined SMEs success. Therefore, the business plan competition has no scientific justification". I understand that there are no scientific papers that justify the use of a business plan as a detriment of SME success. However, are there papers that show the weaknesses of having a business plan as a factor of success? This is quite important since the language used here and throughout the paper is quite strong. - The paragraph that starts in line 147 and finishes in line 186 is perhaps too long, it could possibly be split. - In pages 17-21, the results of the survey are first presented very briefly, followed by a presentation of the literature for each category. Perhaps it would be better to first have a section dedicated only to the results of the survey and then a section that discusses the results of the survey and compares them with previous literature.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper strongly criticises the use of a business plan for selecting SMEs for funding. While I do understand that there is no scientific evidence that this is the optimal approach, I did not see any evidence in this paper that this approach is completely wrong, especially considering the very strong language used by the paper to criticise this approach. If there are issues with corruption etc, then this would need to be highlighted in the paper and supported by evidence or an existing independent assessment. The index proposed by the paper is interesting from an academic point of view. However, I am not convinced that such an index can be used in practice from administrators assessing SMEs for funding. When the European Commission, for example, awards a project for funding, it does so by assessing the project proposal, not by using an index that also includes subjective elements (such as the personal traits of the company owner). Are there any examples around the globe of using such an index for providing funding to companies? If yes they should be highlighted in the paper. Overall, I do think that there is good research in this manuscript (the results of the survey are very interesting) that can be useful for future research in the field of SMEs, but I am not convinced that the two major conclusions of the paper (a. the use of a proposed business plan for awarding funding is a complete failure b. It would be better to use an index) are sufficiently supported by the evidence presented in the paper.	
---	---	--

As per the guideline of editorial office we follow VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Vasileios Rizos</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Energy and Climate Change Unit, Centre for European Policy Studies, Belgium</i>