

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (yes) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 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>	<p>The reviewed paper presents an investigation of several key features of innovation ecosystems in Europe. The study explores the sectoral focus, breadth of park functions, the balance between human and technological focus, the presence of cooperation between commercial and research economies, the prosperity and success of the park, and the characteristics of park management. The paper provides valuable insights into these aspects, contributing to the understanding of innovation ecosystems in Europe. Overall, the paper is well-structured, and the methodology appears robust. However, there are a few areas that require further clarification and improvement.</p> <p>The paper demonstrates a thorough understanding of the existing literature on innovation ecosystems, particularly in the European context. The review of relevant theoretical frameworks and empirical studies enhances the credibility and validity of the research. Moreover, the study employs a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative questionnaire and qualitative data analysis. This methodological choice allows for a comprehensive exploration of the research questions. The sample selection and data collection procedures are adequately described, ensuring transparency and replicability. The findings are presented in a clear and concise manner. The inclusion of tables and figures aids in the interpretation of the results. The discussion of the findings is insightful and effectively relates them to existing literature.</p> <p>While the paper briefly mentions the sectoral focus of the investigated innovation ecosystems, it would be beneficial to provide a more detailed explanation. Specifically, it would be useful to elaborate on the rationale behind the selection of specific sectors and discuss the implications of these choices for the ecosystems under study. In addition, the section on cooperation between commercial and research economies lacks depth. It would be valuable to explore the nature of collaboration within the innovation ecosystems, such as the types of partnerships, knowledge transfer mechanisms, and the role of intermediary organizations. Additionally, it would be beneficial to discuss the challenges and opportunities associated with such cooperation. However, the paper would benefit from a more explicit and comprehensive discussion of the limitations of the study. This could include a reflection on potential biases in the sample selection, the generalizability of the findings, and any methodological limitations that may impact the validity of the results. Acknowledging these limitations would enhance the credibility and transparency of the research.</p> <p>In conclusion, the paper makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of innovation ecosystems in Europe. The comprehensive literature review, rigorous methodology, and clear presentation of findings provide a strong foundation for the research. By addressing the aforementioned suggestions for improvement, the paper has the potential to further enhance its scholarly impact. Overall, this study advances the knowledge of innovation ecosystems and offers insights that can inform policymakers and practitioners in Europe and beyond.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohamed Masry
Department, University & Country	Arab Academy for Science and Technology, Egypt