

**Paper: “SME Instrument: an empirical analysis on the impact of the second phase on the performance of Italian enterprises”**

**Submitted: 07 April 2024**

**Accepted: 17 June 2024**

**Published: 30 June 2024**

Corresponding Author: Peppino De Rose

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p55](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n16p55)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Emmanuel Havi  
Methodist University College Ghana, Ghana

Reviewer 2: Földi Kata  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

# 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: Emmanuel DK Havi	
University/Country: Ghana	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: <b><i>SME Instrument: an empirical analysis on the impact of the second phase of the instrument on the performance of Italian enterprises</i></b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>Rating Result</b>
<b>Questions</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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do 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	<b>X</b>
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

**In your project analysis, instead of proceeding with the gradual elimination of regressors you can use Lasso regression which will select the import variables for you. This will help you save a lot of time. (You may include Data Scientist in your team)**

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

# 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: Kata Földi			
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary			
Date Manuscript Received: 22/04/2024		Date Review Report Submitted: 05/05/2024	
Manuscript Title: SME Instrument: an empirical analysis on the impact of the second phase of the instrument on the performance of Italian enterprises			
ESJ Manuscript Number: 44.04/2024			
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:		<u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>			
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>			

## 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>	<b>Rating Result</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>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The title of the article is correct and related to content.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The abstract contains objects, methods and main results.</i>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>There are not grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The manuscript methods are explained clearly.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

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

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

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

In paragraph 1 of page 3, an Italian sentence remained in the English text, which is as follows:  
Le imprese, dunque, saranno disposte a portare avanti solo progetti che garantisce un certo margine di profito nonostante queste problematiche ma, pochiche non tutte ci riusciranno, il livello di innovazione sarà più basso rispetto al livello socialmente.

Is the unit of measure accurate in the name of Table 1 on page 9, and on page 15, in row 1 of table 2, unit of measure: migl EUR?

Table 1 was broken into two parts at the bottom of page 9 and at the top of page 10

I don't understand what does it mean dummy in table 2 and on page 16. Italian words: Dummy uguale a 1 se l'impresa.

Abbreviation of business forms Italian S.p.a, - public limited company, Srl – limited liability company

Figure 1. Italian designations on a pie chart

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