



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_14355
Title of the Manuscript:	Location of a Competitor and the Regional Innovation Activity of Industrial Systems in Transition Country – Poland's Case Study
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) There are no numeric results in abstract, according to the relevant instructions for authors of the journal. 2) Very good introduction. 3) Good methodology. 4) There are no limits between discussion and results, according to the instructions for authors. So, it must be clear which is the discussion and which the results. 5) Very good use of English language.	1) Sorry, but I didn't find request numeric results in abstract. So they aren't implemented. 4) In every case were added sentences, which should explain even better reasons for the archived results and for the discussion. It was added an extra reference in conclusion connected with author's previous studies.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		