

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_102842
Title of the Manuscript:	Entrepreneurial Resilience: What Makes Entrepreneur Start Another Business After Failure
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.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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript had a importance for scientific community and it refers to entrepreneurial resilience.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. I consider subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript should be improved from a scientific point of view: -the source of figure 1 and table 1 must be indicated; -it is not indicated how 100 entrepreneurs were reached and how they were selected. Why weren't 98 or 103 selected? -the sampling procedure must be detailed.</p> <p>7. The references are not sufficient (only 20) and not recent. There are no bibliographic sources from the last 3 years. How can we talk about resilience without bringing bibliographic sources from recent years, post pandemic, it is not possible that the newest reference about resilience is from 2019!? We recommend introduction of new and bibliographic sources, from 2020-2023 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of English language must be improved. Since the authors do not appear to be native English speakers, I suggest a comprehensive revision of the English language and style for the entire article using Grammarly or another specialized tool.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, it is a good article, with Minor changes can be published in the Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting.</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:	Daniel Boldureanu
Department, University & Country	"Grigore T. Popa" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania