



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44053
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparisons on science and technology innovation efficiency between large-sized and medium-sized industrial enterprises in China: based on DEA method and equal part linear regression
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>)

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In lines 30, 32: Upgradation. There is no result of UPGRADATION in dictionary.com Maybe the author intended AGGRADATION or UPGRADING.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I have deeply probed (examined) this paper. The orientation of the paper is excellent. But I believe that you need one more consultation. Find a DEA (Data Envelopment Analysis) expert.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Husein Mohamed IRBAD</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Lincoln University college, Malaysia</i>