SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Applied Science & Technology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJAST_34723**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Patenting and Technology Entrepreneurship in Nigeria: Issues, Challenges and Strategic Options**
Type of the Article	**Review paper**

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 article is well written, cohesive, with a very relevant theme for the developing economies, which can grow through technological innovation. The subsections are well-linked and objective, bringing a good reflection on entrepreneurship through Spin-Off. Need some adjustments, namely: • The summary should clarify that it's a review article and how it was elaborated. I also suggest withdrawing the sentence from line 13 which states: "This is due to the low quality of the research". This is not a strong reason for the lack of patents, but the other reasons already mentioned in the article. As in the abstract, this same reason appears in lines 204 to 207. It does not necessarily mean low quality research, but the lack of sophisticated technologies as in developed countries. It is complex to compare countries of first and third worlds, because the economic conditions are very different. I suggest considering this in the article. • Although the inference of the study is clear, it is necessary to include the theoretical and practical contributions, as they will increase its robustness and relevance.	Corrected

	• It's missing the space between some words pasted on the lines: 7, 11, 15, 16, 17, 194, 215, 240, 244, 262, 283, 284 • Review the expression "indigenous" in line 53. Is that right? • The sections are not numbered sequentially. • Even though it is a review article, I think that the methodological part should be described, informing the type of the research andthe path followed by the researcher in its elaboration. • When addressing innovationis important to mention the classic Schumpeter. A review article should bring the mainstream of the areas under study (technologies, patents and innovation). • I strongly suggest reading the articles: "**Universities in National Innovation Systems"**, de David C. Mowery and Bhaven N. Sampat.(https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/43161/DavidMowery_1.pdf); "**Challenges Facing Entrepreneurship in Nigeria**", de Onyeka Uche Ofili; "**Framework for Technological Entrepreneurship Development: Key Issues and Policy Directions"**, de Willie O. Siyanbola, Helen O. Aderemi, Abiodun A. Egbetokun e Maruf Sanni e **resultados de pesquisa de patentes de Berkeley**: http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/cgi/viewconten	

	t.cgi?article=3124&context=facpubs. • Correct the author's name mentioned on line 115. • Before the conclusions I suggest including a discussion section of the Nigeria's research results on the entrepreneurial technologies and patents, because they are relevant data that deserve to be discussed in light of the theory used, besides increasing the article's quality. • The conclusions should include the study's limitations. I also suggest replacing "summary" with "conclusions".	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		