

### **Editor's Comment:**

Enclosed please find my editorial decision for the revised paper "Determinant Factors of Micro and Small Enterprises Transformation in to Medium Level Industry: The Case of Addis Ababa City Administration".

My opinion is that the paper is still not good enough for publication.

A detailed list of problems is in the enclosed file.

- I must mention, that there are several problems related to the statistical methodology that both reviewers failed to comment on.
- Besides, the English language of the paper is full of grammatical mistakes, which should also be properly corrected.

I think, that the author should try and correct both the methodological and the language problems, and then the paper can be re-submitted and sent to reviewers again. I do not recommend the publication in its present form.

Editor's decision for the paper

Determinant Factors of Micro and Small Enterprises Transformation in to Medium Level Industry: The Case of Addis Ababa City Administration

The author states that the reviewers' suggestions have been properly addressed, and corrections have been made properly.

However, checking the revised manuscript, this is simply not the case. Besides, there are serious problems, which none of the reviewers commented on. The following problems require proper corrections:

- Lines 193-197: the author uses a formula for deciding the sample size. The editing of the formula is not clear, therefore it is difficult to interpret it. The author should correct the editing of the formula What is "1 +241 (0.1) 2" intended to mean?
- Lines 389—395: there are two long equations (1) and (2) Both have an erroneous left-hand side:

Equation (1) starts as:  $TC(t') - (t)]/\mu = \dots$

Equation (2) starts as:  $EMP(t') - (t)]/\mu =$

In both equations there is a mistaken "]" character, and if you have a closing bracket "]" then you should also have an opening bracket "[" somewhere, which is simply missing! Both reviewers failed to comment on this, but it is obviously a mistake that has to be corrected.

- Line 509 : A new table has been inserted, but the Table number (it should be Table 4.8) is missing before the title

The table also contains mistakes (see line 3: "Begging employee" should obviously be "Beginning employee numbers". These titles should indicate the measurement units, too, for example, in the line: Education level, the Minimum value is 0, and the Maximum value is 1, do they mean years, or what? If a variable contains code values for categories (e.g. no education, elementary education, etc.), then the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation are meaningless!!! The same is true for all the variables. Therefore this table should contain only the scale-variables and none of the category-variables. Gender of the owner is certainly a categorical variable, level of education also looks like a categorical variable, Finance access, and most of the variables listed after it all look like categorical variables (if not, please indicate the measurement unit!)

- Lines 577 to 595: A Skewness/Kurtosis test for Normality is provided (for which variable?) only two tables are shown. There is no indication of which statistical software was used for the test, and no explanation for the tables. Do the table values suggest normal distributions, or non-normal ones, and why? Please state clearly. As Model 1 and Model 2 show rather different results, an explanation is certainly needed.
- Lines 608-609- Table 4.9: Why do you use Pearson correlations and Spearman? do all the variables follow a normal distribution?- see the comment above. Does it really make sense to compute correlations? Are all the variables scale variables? With category variables you should have used a crosstab analysis, with association coefficients, and not Pearson correlations!
- Lines 610-615: The correlations you describe are "significant", but certainly not "relatively strong!" Please correct! (Here Reviewer Raj is also wrong: the significance test shows a significant correlation, but it is not strong!)
- Line 642-643, Table 4.10: Why do you use Pearson correlations and Spearman? do all the variables follow a normal distribution?- see the comment above. Does it really make sense to compute correlations? Are all the variables scale variables? With category variables you should have used a crosstab analysis, with association coefficients, and not Pearson correlations!
- Lines 651-655: The correlations you describe are "significant", but certainly not "relatively strong!" Please correct! (Here Reviewer Raj is also wrong: the significance test shows a significant correlation, but it is not strong!)
- Lines 674 – 848 - Table 4.11, and its explanation: The author uses regression analysis, when most of the explanatory variables seem to be categorical variables and not scale variables. In this case a cross-tabulation analysis would be a more proper way, and not a regression analysis, therefore, though technically it can be carried out. This is a serious methodological error, which none of the reviewers seem to have noticed. The tests should be re-run with the proper procedures suitable for categorical variables, or if not, then the author should give a convincing explanation why to use regression with categorical variables (or explain that the variables are not categorical, but measured in a value scale).
- Finally: Reviewer Raj commented on the bad English of the paper. Although the author says that corrections were made in this respect, the language of the paper is still not good enough. There are many

grammatical mistakes, which make the paper difficult to understand. The paper should be carefully read by a native English speaker or by someone with a really good command of English, and at least the grammatical mistakes (e.g . plural form of the noun with the singular form of the verb, or singular noun with plural verb, etc.) should all be corrected.

My decision is: The paper cannot be published in its present revised form, the author should carefully revise again the statistical methodology applied, and also the language usage. After proper corrections the paper can be re-submitted for further considerations.

**Editor's Details:**

Dr. Zsuzsanna Bacsi  
Georgikon Faculty, University of Pannonia, Hungary