



**Paper: “Role of Government in the Economic Valorization of Innovation and University Research: The Case of Morocco”**

Corresponding Author: Fatima Ouahraoui

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p123

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Priscilla Bahaw  
University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago

Reviewer 2: Dorjana Feimi  
University of Vlora “Ismail Qemali”, Albania

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 30.06.2020

# ***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: Dr. Priscilla Bahaw	Email:
University/Country: The University of the West Indies/Trinidad and Tobago	
Date Manuscript Received: April 9 <sup>th</sup> 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: April 11 <sup>th</sup> 2020
Manuscript Title: The triple helix at the service of innovation and university research-Case of Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0461/20</b>	
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>
<i>Acceptable</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>2.5</b>

<i>No results stated. Significance of paper should be made clear</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Please review example the following spelling of words are incorrect e.g questionnaires' and <b>Gouvernement</b></i></li> </ul>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<i>Justification of the methodology example sample size, selection of participants within the innovation centers, three incubators and three clusters., data collection instruments needed</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<p><i>The body of the paper is very clear and logical however, a major flaw is that the theoretical concepts had no citations. The source of the information together with a synthesized discussion is more relevant and needed in scientific papers</i></p> <p><i>The results of the study was not explained well nor compared to prior research. Discussion of results needed. What are the implications of your findings</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)Not clear on how this paper moved the field of study or filled a gap in the literature. How was the research question answered? What implications are there for the practitioners and for future research? No acknowledgement of limitations</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)Short list of references which sow limited scope of prior studies used. More use of updated studies from scholarly peer reviewed articles required.</i>	

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

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

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

**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:	
University/Country: University of Vlora “Ismail Qemali”	
Date Manuscript Received: 09.04.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 17.04.2020
Manuscript Title: <b>The triple helix at the service of innovation and university research-Case of Morocco</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.04.2020	
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.**

<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>5</b>
<i>This is an interesting topic and adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Yes the abstract present objects, methods but not the results.</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are spelling mistakes. Needs review. For example: "Kaizen lies in this sentence: "Do it better, make it better, improve it even if it is not broken, because if we do not do it, we cannot compete with those who do it. do."</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>The method is explained but for data analysis need a descriptive statistics.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	
<p><b>Adam Smith</b> considers that technological innovation is induced by the know-how of the workers and by the work of "scientists or theorists". <i>In this sentence the year of the source must be set.</i></p> <p><b>David Ricardo</b> distinguishes several configurations of inventions: manufacture of a new good, introduction of a new production method, opening of a new outlet, realization of a new organization. The innovation, referring to him, concerns the mechanization of work: although it increases the profit of the entrepreneur by decreasing the wage fund, and causes more technological unemployment. <i>In this sentence the year of the source must be set.</i></p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>References should be more complete. More articles should be used as references. The Global Innovation Index is not included in the references. The APA referencing style is required.</i>	

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

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

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

**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:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 09/10/2202	Date Review Report Submitted: 19/04/2020
Manuscript Title: The triple helix at the service of innovation and university research-Case of Morocco	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 61.04.2020	
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>4</b>
<i>The title is appropriate, and it captures the interest of the reader. It is suggested to revise it as : The Case of Morocco rather than Case of Morocco.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>



<i>Abstract presents objects, methods but not the results.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Please proofread the paper once again and improve the language.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>It is advised to show references for the use of this particular methodology. Please explain more in detail why and how this methodology was chosen.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Overall the body is wo</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Conclusions are supported by the data however it is worth to mention the practical implications for all the stakeholders.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><i>Please include references for the following section:</i></p> <p><i>The neoclassic theory of innovation</i></p> <p><i>You are mentioning many theories however you have not cited any of them.</i></p> <p><i>Also arrange the references as per the referencing style of the journal.</i></p>	

**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):**

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

**European Scientific Journal**  
European Scientific Institute

