
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: 25.02.2017	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:07.03.2017
Manuscript Title: Innovation Implementation by SMEs in Trinidad and Tobago	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0335/17	

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.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The title is clear and accurately reflects the content of the paper.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The abstract is clear and presents a good summary of the paper.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Grammatical errors, poor sentence construction and punctuation issues are detected throughout the paper.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The study methods are insufficiently explained. Greater	

detail and coherence in terms of explaining the survey administration, sampling and statistical methods used are needed.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> The flow of the paper is logical and the heading names match the content within them. The rating of 3 was given for the grammatical issues, sentence construction issues and lack of numbered headings. Additionally, it is very important that the author report on the general characteristics of the respondent/firm.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> Yes they do, however, where possible conducting tests of statistical inference for estimating associations could boost the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> References are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Overall, the work in the paper is important and contributes to the field, after revision of grammatical errors, sentence construction and punctuation; addition of a summary of the general characteristics of the respondent/firm, and modification of the methodology to make it clearer, the paper should be accepted.
- Optional: the author could consider conduction statistical tests to better understand associations.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

- Overall, the work in the paper is important and contributes to the field, after

revision of grammatical errors, sentence construction and punctuation; addition of a summary of the general characteristics of the respondent/firm, and modification of the methodology to make it clearer, the paper should be accepted.

