



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_35784
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ENVIRONMENT OF SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED ENTERPRISE (SME) OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: VECTOR OR INHIBITOR FOR THEIR INTERNATIONAL PERFORMANCE?
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 (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	There are some problems with this paper. The principal one is the inadequate sample size. In order to overcome this issue, the authors will need to find some means of triangulating the existing data. This might be other statistics or some qualitative interviewing of SME owners or managers. The concept of SME is not defined in the context of Cameroon – each country has a standard definition and this should be specified. The literature review contains works that are quite elderly. The authors should make some efforts to update it with the new ideas that have emerged in recent years. The theory of denaturation is mentioned in the abstract and introduction but after that it disappears completely. The methodology section omits too many details. How, exactly, did questionnaire construction take place? What kind of pilot test was involved? What language issues exist? What about the possibility of non-response bias? The discussion section should be separated from the conclusion and used to discuss the findings in the light of the theoretical framework. This is where the claim for contribution to academic knowledge will be made. The conclusion section should incorporate limitations to research. Only those recommendations or assumptions that are supported by the research findings should be included.	Ok Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		