



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_46451
Title of the Manuscript:	Transformation Factors of Micro and Small Enterprises in to Medium Level Industry: The Case of Addis Ababa City Administration
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. The research paper is too lengthy and there are adequate evidences for simplifying the paper with good English. There many areas of repetition of the same subject dealt with.</p> <p>2. In abstract, provide the key correlation result where author claims high positive, high negative and no significance. The interpretation of the data must get reflected in the abstract in a short two liner.</p> <p>3. Under Literature review, prior to defining justification for this study, list out the key gaps identified in support of this study.</p> <p>3. Extract all the hypothesis made and discussed in analysis section and describe under Research methodology.</p> <p>4. The normality test results need to be addressed in justification of Non-Parametric statistic selection.</p> <p>5. The model specification must be justified with research references.</p> <p>6. The ACCEPTANCE LIMIT for qualifying correlation results are not proper and in many places wrong interpretations were made.</p> <p>a. Table 4.9 Pearson correlation analysis result for MSE support reported was +0.025. This is almost no correlation where as the author claims that highly positive and significant which is wrong.</p> <p>b. Table 4.10 The correlation results for management know-how reported was +0.196, which is 'NO CORRELATION', where as the author claims it as significant.</p> <p>7. Summary section must address whether all the research objective defined are studied and satisfied.</p> <p>8. Under recommendations for further research, the author recommends the need for extending this research with increased sample size. This brings a fundamental question of how is this research study valid then? The sampling size was justified already with the statistical means and hence this is not relevant. The author needs to address both construct and content validity of the RESEARCH INSTRUMENT in support of this under research methodology.</p>	I found the reviewers comment very helpful and i really appreciate your valuable comment. I am considering every comment in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>There are no ethical issues. This paper is my original paper and there are no any other competing interest</u>	I appreciate your concern here. It is my work that no ethical issue will be raised.