

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_97918
Title of the Manuscript:	Explore the mechanism construction of collaborative education in colleges and universities under the guidance of innovation and entrepreneurship
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Not really. I suggested this one, e.g. Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Collaborative Education in Colleges and Universities Not really. There are some mistakes found. Yes Yes Yes, however, it should vbe revised as it should be arranged alphabetically.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not really. In my opinion, you have to improve your English.	
Optional/General comments	There are mistakes found, as mentioned in Review Section in the text. I think, you have to explore your work in order to make it clear practically, instead of theoretically.	

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 1.7](#)

viewer Details:

Name:	Ana Purwitasari
Department, University & Country	University of Freiburg, Germany