



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <b><u>British Journal of Economics, Management &amp; Trade</u></b>                                                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>2014_BJEMT_14355</b>                                                                                                                |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Location of a Competitor and the Regional Innovation Activity of Industrial Systems in Transition Country – Poland's Case Study</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>                                                                                                       |

**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)                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>The paper in general is well structured using an accepted method. It needs to take consideration for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. References on the paragraph 30-37</li> <li>2. When discussing the results, it is advisable to give reasons for the results, and to indicate why such differences happening. You can refer to other results and compare it to your own results to give more evidences.</li> <li>3. Avoid generalization in writing up without giving evidences by providing previous studies. See your conclusion.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Added missing reference.</li> <li>2. In every case were added sentences, which should explain even better reasons for the archived results.</li> <li>3. Added an extra reference in conclusion connected with author's previous studies.</li> </ol> |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>It is advised to have a look again for the general write up and the connections between paragraphs.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <p>I realized that methodology is writing different language (statistical), than rest paragraphs of the paper, but I have volume restrictions. That's why it require many short cuts.</p>                                                                                                     |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | <p>Have a look to the format of writing the abstract. It should be a bit shorter more focus and direct without disturbing its flow by the bold words of its sections</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <p>Abstract was rebuild and it's shorter. Bold sections are required by publisher, in my opinion.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                         |