



**Paper: “Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Innovativeness in Manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises: The Moderating Effect of Environmental Dynamism”**

Corresponding Author: Benedict Wandera Mkalama

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n13p199](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n13p199)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hussain AlSalamin  
King Fiasal University, Saudi Arabia

Reviewer 2: Faloye Olaleye Dotun  
Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Michael Ba Banutu-Gomez  
Rowan University, USA

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Published: 31.05.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Hussain AlSalamin (MBA)	
University/Country: King Fiasal University / Saudi Arabia	
Date Manuscript Received: 23.4.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 29.4.2020
Manuscript Title: Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Innovativeness in Manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises: The Moderating Effect of Environmental Dynamism	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0513/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes</span> /No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<b><i>Questions</i></b>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article but it was a long title.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4.5</b>
<i>I like the abstract which was very clear and presents objects obviously. Methods and results are presented clearly. Recommendations from authors were listed at the end of abstract and keyword were fit with complete topic. It should not write</i>	

<i>abbreviated word as first time without any explanation of that word.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<i>There were few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article which is clarified in the body and need to correct.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The study methods are explained very well with a clear insight for the instrumentation used that supported by the reason of choosing these methods. The validity were tested by several methods to make sure about the data validity and reliability.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The body of the paper is clear and it contain some minor errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The conclusion are accurate and supported by content and old studies. But it is small and you need to add more paragraph.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate with alphabetical order.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please use academic words and styles while writing in published paper. In addition, for the abbreviated words that used first time in paragraph, you have to explain these words stand for.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Dr. Faloye Olaleye Dotun	
University/Country: Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba Akoko, Nigeria	
Date Manuscript Received: 23/4/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 3/5/2020
<b>Manuscript Title: Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Innovativeness in Manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises: The Moderating Effect of Environmental Dynamism</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0513/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title is very clear and adequate. The Independent, Dependent and Moderating variables are captured in the research title.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>The Abstract is detailed. The objects, methods and results are cleared and well arranged.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The Authors are very clever in spelling and sentences construction</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The research design, study population, sample and sampling methods are well stated. Also the research instrument, data collection method, data analysis techniques, model specification, data reliability and validity were clearly stated.</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>There was no error noticed in the body of the paper</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The content is adequately supported and suggestion for further studies is cleared</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The paper is consistent with a reference style. Besides, the references are appropriate and comprehensive enough.	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Nil**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** The paper addressed one of the gaps in literature on the SMEs innovation thus the paper is publishable.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: Michael Ba Banutu-Gomez	
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 4/25/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: "Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Innovativeness in Manufacturing Small and Medium Enterprises: The Moderating Effect of Environmental Dynamism"	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12994-37773-1-RV	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:    Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:    Yes/No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The author(s) should read the paper to clean up minor grammar errors.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This was a well thought-out paper. The author(s) reviewed lots of literature. Good choice of literature. The methodology utilized was good and statistical packaged used was the right for this study. Table 5, 6, 7, and 8 were very helpful in this paper. The author(s) did well in discussing the results. The conclusion was good.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

**I enjoyed reading this paper. The author(s) did a fantastic job in the discussion and conclusion sections.**