

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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!

Date Manuscript Received: Dec 01, 2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: Dec 03, 2017
Manuscript Title: The network contract model for the growth of SMEs the case of an Italian region	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1254/17	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>In my opinion, the title can be written as: The importance of network contract model for SMEs` growth. The case of an Italian region</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract is well organized but it has to do more at the findings. It is not clarify the reader about what is expected as the findings of the abstract should do.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>The paper needs to proofread, since some sentences need correction. Due to the poor English, it marks hard to understand the methodology part of the paper and also other parts of the paper.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The author explains that it is the first step of the working project but he has to be clear about the used methodology. Although the data come from credible sources, the study is not based on robust and clear methods to draw valid conclusions.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3

<i>The author declares to study the comparison of the characteristics of the network contract with the principles of business models and does not explain which the business model he uses to study is</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The author has spent more time to find consistent results.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<p><i>There are a lot of citations in the paper not corresponding with the references at the end of the paper.</i> There are missed references: Normann (2001) Woodside (2010) Yin(1994) Tiscini et al., 2014 Becattini, 1989 Williamson, 1985, 1991 Ministry of Economic Development, 2010 Italian finance law 99/2009 contract former law 122/2010</p> <p><i>The author has written a lot of references at the end of the paper which are not mention during the content of the paper.</i> Rappa, M. (2004), Stahler, P. (2002)</p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- The paper needs arrangements according the given template of ESJ (headings, subheadings, etc.)
- The paper needs a recheck for problems in language, since some sentences are not in correct English.
- Although the author states that deductive-inductive with a multi method approach is used, the study is simply a description and interpretation of facts.
- The tables and charts are not formatted well according the font size writing.
- References should be added at the end of the paper, and its corresponding citation will be added in the order of their appearance in the text. The author should ensure that every reference in the text appears in the list of references and vice versa.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

