



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_35764
Title of the Manuscript:	DEVELOPMENTS IN INNOVATION ACTIVITIES IN TURKEY: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF 2010-2012 AND 2012-2014 PERIODS
Type of the 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	Re: Manuscript Review Ms 35764 <i>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</i> 1. The paper should be published after corrections have been made. I grade the paper 9 on novelty, originality, technical strength and language Performance. 2. I suggest revised title: "Innovation Activities in Turkey: Comparative Analysis of 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Periods." 3. The author lists 21 references at the end. The author refers to these references by number surrounded by brackets in the text. I see [1], [2], [3], [4,5], [6], [7,8], [9], [10], [11,12] — fine, all in proper sequence and all well encapsulated. Then, line 77, the author cites [20] without giving the number surrounded by brackets. On line 83 the author is referring back to [12] also without giving the number surrounded by brackets. On line 88 the author refers to the extremely important reference [16] without giving the number surrounded by brackets. That reference must have further elaboration. Line 97 has [13, 14]. Line 108 has [15] Line 127 cites TurStat without a reference number surrounded by brackets. Line 137 cites [16,17]. This looks like an error—the author meant [17, 18]. Line 316 cites [18]. This looks like an error—the author meant [19]. 4. The article is well written, informative and interesting. I found the author's outline excellent, as follows: ABSTRACT 1. INTRODUCTION 2. CONCEPT OF INNOVATION AND THE SORTS 3. 3. MATERIAL, METHOD AND THE FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH 3.1. Objective and Scope 3.2. Method 3.3. Evaluation of the Research Findings 3.3.1. Innovative Enterprises Conducting Innovation Fig. 1: Innovative Enterprises and Innovation Types, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 3.3.2. Product Innovation Enterprises in Turkey Fig. 2: Innovation Levels of Enterprises, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 3.3.3. Process Innovative Enterprises in Turkey Fig. 3: Innovative Process Enterprises, 2010-2012 and 2012-	1. Thank you. 2. I changed the title. Thanks. 3. I made the changes for the author list. There was a mistake. Thanks. 4. Thank you. 5. As Abstract is word limited, I keep it short. For the conclusion i added more highlights about the figures. 6. Thank you very much.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2014 Comparison. 3.3.4. Organizational Innovation Initiatives in Turkey Fig. 4: Implementation of Organizational Innovation Types, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 3.3.5. Marketing Innovation Activities in Turkey Fig. 5: Implementation of Marketing Innovation Types, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 3.3.6. Sustainability of Enterprises in Innovation Activities Fig. 6: Innovative Enterprise and Sustainability, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 3.3.7. Status of Enterprises in Innovation Activities Receiving Financial Support Fig. 7: Financial Support Ratios of Enterprises, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 3.3.8. Radical Product Innovations of Product Innovative Enterprises Fig. 8: Radical Innovations by Region, 2010-2012 and 2012-2014 Comparison. 4. CONCLUSION 5. I would like to see in the conclusion and in the abstract more highlights from the author's 8 figures. 6. I highly commend the authors for their fine research.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		