SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJEMT_6759**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Enterprise Excellence through Growth Strategy and Risk Management**
Type of the Article	**Case Study**

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	This paperaddresses an interesting topic in principle. However, I see some weaknesses, primarily related to the lack of a clear focus. I elaborate on this (and other issues) below. 1) Your Abstract is not particularly informative and your Introduction does not state clearly what you are going to research.The first three paragraphs of the abstract introduce the three concepts of enterprise excellence (EE), enterprise growth and enterprise risk, respectively, but how they relate to one another and how they qualify the focus of the paper remains quite obscure. My advice is reflect more on the aim of the paper and re-write both abstract and introduction highlighting the research questions that you want to address and identifying the "conversation" you paper joins within management literature. 2) The first part of the paper seems to suggest that study focuses on EE. However, this concept is then neglected throughout the paper. Please clarify the core idea of the paper and develop the paper around this. 3) The paper presents several models and concepts of management but linkages among them are not clear. Enterprise excellence, growth strategy, risk management, product life cycle, diffusion of innovation, core competence are some of the concepts that you mention in the various sections of the paper. The reader is quite confused about the positioning of the paper within existing literature and its contribution. Each section	

	seems to cover a different topic with little or no connection among them. This results in a lack of a unifying framework, which in turn conveys the idea of fragmentation. I would suggest you to focus on a more limited set of models and concepts and develop them more deeply and consistently around a core idea. 4) Please be more parsimonious with the use of figures. For example, it is not clear what figure 4 is meant for. Moreover, I do not fully understand the focus on diffusion of innovation (figure 2) at the beginning of section 2. From my read of the paper, this model is not the key element of your framework. 5) In the section on case study scenarios, you do not provide any data about companies (e.g. size, age, nationality, strategy etc.). Without such information, the relevance of the cases is questionable. 6) The logic behind the selection of the three cases is not explained. This becomes even more relevant, given the high heterogeneity of the organizations included in the analysis (the management of a non-profit organization likely raises different issues compared to the others). 7) The contribution of the paper to existing literature and the managerial implications are not outlined in the conclusion section. I would suggest that you expand your discussion and conclusion sections to clarify the contribution(s) of your paper and its relevance/implications. 8) There is a strong lack of references in section two (especially 2.3 and 2.4)	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	9) I would suggest you to use more academic phrases and avoid the use of informal expressions (e.g. "so," at line 168, suspension points at line 378) 10) I recommend a professional editing to avoid both grammar and punctuation mistakes (e.g. line 77, 87,89,90,103,104, etc.) 11) I would not directly address the reader using "you" (e.g. line 479) 12) Exhibit 1 is not clear: as they seem to betwo separate figures, you should split them. In addition,you should better represent the second graph of Exhibit 1 in order to make causal relationships more understandable. 13) Decide whether to use "exhibit" or "figure" and be consistent throughout the paper. 14) Please change the title of section 2 "model analysis with literature survey" as "model analysis" is not clear to me and "literature survey" does not reflect the content of the section.	
Optional/Generalcomments	You select "case study" as type of paper. However, From my read of the paper,this is not a case study. Rather, the three cases are incidents you use to clarify the theoretical concepts and models presented in the first part of the paper. My advice is to restructure and rewrite the manuscript after reflecting more onyour framework andthe core idea and aim of the study.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer