

**Paper: “The Significance of Innovation Orientation in Firm Performance:
Technological Capabilities as A Moderating Role”**

Submitted: 01 March 2024

Accepted: 15 April 2024

Published: 30 April 2024

Corresponding Author: Alfateh Fegada

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n10p16](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n10p16)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Imad Ait Lhassan
Université Abdelmalek Essaadi, Maroc

Reviewer 2: Angelica Sterling
Universidad del Caribe, Mexico

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: IMAD AIT LHASSAN	
University/Country: Université Abdelmalek Essaadi - Maroc	
Date Manuscript Received: 22/03/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 27/03/2024
Manuscript Title: The Significance of Innovation Orientation in Firm Performance: Technological Capabilities as A Moderating Role	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0409/24	
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]
------------------	---

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is precise and aligns well with the content of the article.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract encompasses objectives, methods, and findings.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p>There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 3 needs a correction: "Disterbution" should be changed to "Distribution." • Section 4.6 should be titled "Reliability of Scales Using Cronbach's alfa (Alpha)" • The title of Table 5 should be "Reliability of Scales Using Cronbach's alfa (Alpha)" 	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The study methods are clearly outlined and explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clearly presented.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions and discussion are precise and backed by the content.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references provided are thorough and relevant.	

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):

Your work is generally of good quality, but there are a few suggestions for improving your article.

- I recommend presenting the research findings for the first hypothesis before moving on to the second (Page 6 – 8), which is not necessarily contradictory. Alternatively,

you could consider renumbering the hypotheses in both the literature review and results sections.

- Figure 1 requires some additional information.
- Please double-check Table 5; the total number of items should be 29, not 28.
- On page 19, please correct the table number referenced in the paragraph "The results presented in **Table 28** suggest that the..."
- Adding your research model with results obtained from the AMOS software would greatly enhance the value of your work, in my opinion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The authors have produced a high-quality research paper that deserves publication in the journal, following the suggested improvements.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Angelica Selene Sterling Zozoaga	
University/Country: Universidad del Caribe	
Date Manuscript Received: March 25 th , 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: April 1 st , 2024
Manuscript Title: The Significance of Innovation Orientation in Firm Performance: Technological Capabilities as A Moderating Role	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0409/24	
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]
------------------	--

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The main content of the article is about the relationship between innovation orientation and firm performance with the use of technological capabilities; the title states that the paper's main subject is the significance of innovation orientation; to rephrase it to show the main subject accurately is recommended</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The information accurately describes the work done. However, it is recommended not to use abbreviations in the resume. The hypothesis in this part of the paper could be omitted to make the resume more focused and precise in describing the problem statement, main purpose, methodology, and relevant findings.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Some paragraphs could be improved to make the idea more precise; some are pointed with yellow on the paper. Figure 1 information needs to be completed.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Excellent job describing the methodology implemented; however, in the quantitative methodology, there is some information that could be omitted, such as the one explaining the importance/process of data cleaning, missing data, unengaged responses, and outlier, the suggestion is to keep only the information about the unengaged responses. It is recommended that all the hypotheses be presented before showing the results and then accepting or rejecting them.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>It is suggested to separate the methodology from the results obtained, i.e., the information on 4.6 Reliability of Scales Using Cronbach's Alfa there is information regarding the methodology (calculating the Cronbach's Alfa) and some other about the results after doing the calculation; the same for 4.7 Path analysis the first paragraph is about the methodology, and after that, the results are shown. It is highly recommended that all the information regarding the result be separated and put together; the methodology, discussions, and conclusions must be differentiated from the results.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>There is information presented as a conclusion that does not connect with the results presented in previous sections. i.e., nothing shows how the authors have explored the dynamics of innovation orientation and its impact on firm performance; it shows the relationship only. The second paragraph points out that the study highlighted the importance of contextual factors, but the paper does not provide any information describing this.</i>	

On the other hand, in the introduction section it states that this research seeks to offer practical insights and strategic recommendations tailored to the challenges and opportunities faced by SMEs and an actionable guidance for SME leaders, but it is not accomplished with the information presented.

Therefore, it is recommended that the purpose of the paper be connected to the results achieved and the conclusions obtained.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

4

Even though there are some recent references, a significant part of the literature review is based on references older than ten years. It is recommended to look for more recent studies about the topics presented; they are marked in green on the paper.

Some citations in the text are not in the reference list, and vice versa; they are marked in blue.

It is necessary to complete reference 19, listing all the authors

It is necessary to review the citation on paragraph 2, page 3 (in the text and reference list); paragraph 1, page 3; paragraph 1 and last line, page 9 (in the text and the reference list)

Reference number 2 on the reference list states that the publishing year is 2018, but when it is quoted in the last paragraph on page 7, it says 2011.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is a very interesting paper with relevant information that will provide a starting point for future research. That is why it is recommended that the specifics of the methodology regarding the research instruments and the results obtained be elaborated deeply, which will point out the conclusions presented.

It is recommended to update the information on tables 1 and 2.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: