



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_39556
Title of the Manuscript:	CONSTRUCTION FIRMS' INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL IN SOUTHEAST MEXICO
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The description of methodology in the abstract should be presented more precisely (The questionnaire survey was used but there is no information about normalization method which was implemented). The last sentence considering research results is too long and difficult to understand. In lines: 32 and 225 the word "environment" should be rather in a singular form. The same case refers to "innovation". In the section devoted to methodology the references are needed.	Explanation about methodology was added in the abstract: "The methodology consisted in the application of a questionnaire to employees at operational and managerial levels; This instrument was organized into two sections, one to measure intellectual capital and another to measure structural capital, and was developed based on a system of indicators that have already been used in other industries internationally." In the methodology it was recognized that the questionnaire was not normalized, so its results cannot be compared quantitatively with other studies: "Being this a first exploration in the region to the phenomenon studied, the instrument was not normalized, so in quantitative terms its results are not susceptible to be compared with other studies." In the methodology, all the parts that were taken from other studies were referenced: [13], [14] and [15]. The indicated spelling errors were fixed.
Minor REVISION comments	In conclusion I would emphasize that in the analysed industry a greater shortcomings in the area of structural capital than human capital were observed.	A paragraph that addresses the recommendation was added to the conclusions: "In the construction firms analyzed, greater deficiencies were observed in their structural Capital than in their Human Capital; so, this must be assumed as a challenge to address in the short term."
Optional/General comments	In the assessment of IC components I recommend the implementation of SEM methodology.	Because SEM methodology is mainly used for the validation of models, the authors consider that its application is not necessary for an exploratory study, such as the present one.