

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103983
Title of the Manuscript:	The influence of technological innovation level on high-tech industrial agglomeration——Take the Chinese region for example
Type of the Article	Grey Literature

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:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, there is some value in FDI's</p> <p>No, it does not make sense. Just use this part: The influence of technological innovation level on high-tech industrial agglomeration</p> <p>No, please add more to the abstract.</p> <p>Please add a section on background to the study.</p> <p>No, it is difficult to follow and appears to be an overview of other studies, but it is difficult to make the connection.</p> <p>Yes, references are a mixture of current and seminal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please run through a grammar and spell check program as there are several areas where improvements are needed to enhance understanding and readability. Please watch anthropomorphisms. The paper cannot do anything, you can as a the researcher. Your methodology and research design are unclear. What are your variables? Is this just a lit review of other research studies? The objective is unclear.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jan Tucker
Department, University & Country	Columbia Southern University, USA