



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_18556
Title of the Manuscript:	Goal-based Key Performance Indicators of Science Parks' Effectiveness: A Case Study at Riyadh Techno-Valley
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	a) Theoretical framework The manuscript presents a relevant case study on Science Park and its effectiveness, throughout a quantitative scale. The underlying assumption is that a Science Park is an important piece for achieving a knowledge economy. Therefore, the RTV was expected to drive growth development, at least in the local level, and then its effects was supposed to be observed in economic variables, either universities, corporates and industries or employee and government data. In this sense, the authors could assess the possibility of improving the theoretical framework, pursuing to relate RTV and growth variables, clarifying which theory holds such an idea and testing its hypothesis, beyond examining the opinion of 3 experts. b) Literature review From 28 cited papers, only 8 of them were	a) We have already have the assumption and using KPI based on best science park as explained in section 4, figure 4 b) Literature review is updated to include 4 more recent publications for Science Park. This is highlighted end of section 3, and relevant references have also been added at the end of the paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	published after 2010 and specially on the proposition of a method for assessing the effectiveness of Science Parks, only 2 fulfil such a requisite. It becomes highly important due to the fact that other authors could have proposed a similar method and furthermore the recent literature review allows the evaluation of manuscript's importance and the discussion of its results. Therefore, it is recommendable to improve the literature review, examining recent published papers on the same subject, in order to strengthen the relevance of proposed method. c) Validity of the scale and the results In the manuscript, the authors posit there are four main areas for identifying the key performance indicators (R&D; Business; Management, and; Infra-Structure). Beyond the issues about theoretical framework, described on the first topic of this form, the validity of the instrument applied to the experts is a central question on the results' analysis. In order to gathering further robustness for the proposed scale, the authors should compare the paper's results to other obtained by the application of other methods to the RVT and then assess the eventual convergences or superiorities.	c) We have relied on three managers who have experience and knowledge about RTV, while we can't rely on other managers who don't have knowledge about RTV. We could however, rely on experts in Science park who can audit the performance of RTV and use their result in our study but this is beyond our control as this require approval from high level administration of King Saud University to conduct such audit.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Although the scale has been applied to three experts that worked in RVT, there is a serious restriction that should be addressed in the research. The total of respondents seems to be very few. Such a restriction could be worked out with further tests, as those suggested in the first topic of this form or by increasing the number of respondents.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		