



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7277
Title of the Manuscript:	Introducing a Model for Identifying Operative Enablers of Supply Chain Quality Management
Type of the Article	Short 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	The study is very interesting since it provides new insights to the relevant scientific research. The language is clear and understandable, while the authors provided an impressive literature review upon the specific topic that is apparently reinforce the authors' valuable contribution to the existing knowledge. Nevertheless, the authors are highly recommended to critically address the following aspects of: • An extensive and descriptive representation of the firms themselves that were interviewed is needed. Particularly, the authors should provide the main characteristics –workforce size, salaries, educational status of the personnel–fiscal and economic status of these firms or the relevant entrepreneurial market in a national level of data available. • Both Benchmarking and Leapfrog technologies that should apply in the region and companies of their study should be explicitly stated, where applicable and where appropriate.	The authors are inclined to acknowledge you for the precious comments. All of comments were reviewed and almost any necessary change has been made as much as possible. A table which consists of Some available Characteristics is provided to the Context. But the respective firms were not eager to cooperate more and didn't respond to Economic Status questions and just invalid data gathered. Also Researchers Couldn't Find any entrepreneurial market in that area. The status of cases for Using Benchmarking technologies was in poor level and it has not been discussed separately. But some of them are mentioned in each case analysis. No logistical factor was found in SCQM



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• The role of Logistics in the study, mentioning any traditional methodologies, such as the “LiFo” and “FiFo” approaches, addressing the easiness of transition to the model proposed by the authors. • Effective development and expansion potential of the existing transportation infrastructure at the examined region. Does the main launched products of the firms examined, imports or exports goods? The reasoning of this wider overview of the existing study is necessary since it will enable the authors to clearly: • Signify the key factors of the specific Supply Chain Quality Management Model. • Reveal the integrated role of analogous models’ proposal and lunch to in-field applications. • Direct the existing methodological approaches to new entrepreneurial schemes, possible offered in other entrepreneurial sectors. • Reveal, the innovative elements of the study’s contribution to understanding the integrated role of the model’s prosperity in transforming its threads to opportunities, minimizing its weaknesses, and maximizing its strengths. This	literature, but the firms have been investigated shortly in terms of logistical and inventory factors. All of firms are using primary transportation methods. And lots of systems can be used in order to improve the whole system. In table 2 and 3 the enablers of SCQM have been mentioned. Rankings and importance of each factor are discussed separately in each case description. Mentioned in Conclusion Section SWOT Analysis was done While some suggestions proposed to improve the process.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	indicative SWOT frame of the proposed model – in the terms of Strengths-Weakness-Opportunities-Threads is highly welcome to be incorporated within the existing text body, since it will reinforce the innovative elements of the authors own hard working. The authors should revise the legends of x- and y-axes at Figures 2 and 3 to a more meaningful entity, since the current format of the legends is rather abstracted/ vague. In parallel, explicit association and narrative should be given between the Figures 2 and 3 outcomes within the text body.	Changes have been done. Also try to clarify the tables.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The full names of all abbreviations within the text body should be precisely presented at their first time inclusion within the text body. It is indicatively referred that the abbreviation of the “QC” and “SCM” are firstly presented in the 26th and 27th lines, while their full names are presented in the 28th -30th lines. The authors should align and comply to the BJEMT guidelines and reference style, since in the existing text body there are simultaneously two distinct ways of citation: [numbering] and (full names, year of publication).	Corrected All of References change to numbering mode, as shown in the sample form.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		