

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_102758
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of characteristics of European innovation ecosystems
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extremely relevant, it will help to understand not only the form, but the content and relationship of the agents studied in the research. 2. I suggest: Impact of assessing the characteristics of European innovation ecosystems on business and society 3. It will be readjusted based on my suggestion commented at the end of this evaluation. 4. include generated impacts, ESG concepts and corporate social responsibility and environmental management. 5. Yes, but I suggest readjusting the entire survey to identify gaps and relevant findings of the respondents' reason to identify correlation in the constructs inherent to parts of the triple helix and their impact on decisions and advancement of knowledge in people, companies and other stakeholders. 6. Include more articles on the topic that cover ecosystems and impact on company, social, environmental and economic value. (additional suggestions/comments) <p>Considerations and suggestions for the research, I emphasize that the article has potential, but it needs to adjust the identified notes.</p> <p>The effect of innovation is generated from the bottom up But the effect of knowledge is generated from top to bottom The balance of the triple helix is to keep these constructs/agents in a synergistic way, acting to boost and keep the market warm. Therefore, decisions must start and be driven by academia, then go through the legal aspect of the government and finally be implemented in the private sector and industry, that is, by generating economic results and implementing corporate strategies. Thus, the economy is the tank of this vehicle, knowledge is the fuel and science is the direction to be followed, and industry is the driver of this vehicle/vehicle, called innovation. Therefore, the final objective is to generate value for the interested parties, one of which is the client, investors and other financing agents. Thus, the main interest and result of knowledge ecosystems is to generate new knowledge through joint research work, collaboration or development of a solid and robust knowledge base.</p> <p>Method - To validate the original assumptions of this research, a 15-question questionnaire was sent to the pre-selected parks. Conclusions were drawn by qualitative processing and analysis of the responses received. It lacked detailing the quantitative and relative and absolute statistical percentage of the values presented in the research for the construct Sectorial focus. In the construct Diversity of the park's community, he pointed out the presence and absence of agents, but did not identify the reason for this to occur, I think it is opportune to point this out, as it is the main finding of the research, so I suggest that you carry out these adjustments, as it will contribute to the advancement of the science (figure 3). In figure 4 - Shows the pattern of technological and human orientations, it is also necessary to detail this point because it points to the correlation of these constructs as relevant by the respondents, but does not identify the reason for this attributed value. technology and continuous training of human resources".</p> <p>In the other parts of the article, follow this logic, pointing out what, and why, still relating this to the literature and whether the industry actually follows an interdisciplinary and academic trend on the formation of knowledge and its value within the industry itself. If in fact it is knowledge that develops people, or people who build this knowledge over time, in a participatory way.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Soares Francisco de Almeida
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil