

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_94192
Title of the Manuscript:	Entrepreneurship in family businesses and their impact on the social business development in Trujillo-Peru
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:

<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You need to better highlight the research problem, I noticed that the objective is present in the abstract, but it did not establish the problem to be answered, so I suggest including it in the abstract;</li> <li>2. I also suggest including the research problem at the end of the introduction to clearly establish what we are investigating and proposing to answer;</li> <li>3. I did not notice the article apart from the basis of the research, this weakens the support of the adopted method itself, and the instrument used to carry out the research;</li> <li>4. I suggest in this sense, to place the foundation of the research, from the constructs that were proposed in the model to be analysed;</li> <li>5. Another perception is that how the questionnaire was constructed, the questions and the model of each construct and hypothesis to be answered was absent from the research. This needs to be evident in the article to give notoriety;</li> <li>6. At the end of the result, I suggest that a comparative table be made of the research constructs by author, pointing out what the academy thinks and how the respondents will define and understand these;</li> <li>7. The article has potential, as long as these adjustments are made.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In conclusion, present whether the research problem, objectives and questions were properly answered and how and what understanding was drawn from this;</li> <li>2. I also suggest that it be built based on the question, and from the findings obtained from the instrument, pointing out what the academy, based on the foundation, establishes, and how the respondents perceived the behavior of the constructs;</li> <li>3. With regard to the result, it is well constructed, but it is important to put a table, the questions, hypotheses, the model, the authors that support it and then the percentages that the research achieved with the sample of 73 companies</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article has potential and can be a research of great relevance.	

### 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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

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