
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: 7.3.17	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:8.3.17
Manuscript Title: Innovation Implementation by SMEs in Trinidad and Tobago Priscilla Bahaw PhD	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 35.03.2017	

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>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
a professional proofreading of the paper is recommended in order to avoid primary language' influence	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4

<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>the empirical body is well structurend and exploited</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(a brief explanation is recommendable)</i> <i>I found a lack of the most recent literature contribution to the topic, the theoretical background shoud be updated</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I appreciate reading the paper, but the theoretical background is too much focused on UNESCO and Government documents instead of scientific literature. The contributions found are not updated. I suggest you to upgrade the first part of the paper with the most recent ones.

The empirical case is well described.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

European Scientific Journal
European Scientific Institute

