

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>)

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper is important for scientific community but need to improve in terms of clear contribution of study. Too general discussion and unclear objectives. Need to be specific.</p> <p>Title of article is suitable based on the context</p> <p>Abstract - State the contribution of study</p> <p>Introduction - Limited research is presented moderately relevant and will make a nominal contribution to the field. Need some figures or statistics to support the study. Sound work which expresses a coherent position only in broad terms and in uncritical conformity to one or more standard views of the topic.</p> <p>LR - Adequate knowledge of the relevant literature. Minor shortcomings in the interpretation and application of the literature. Evidence of a satisfactory knowledge and limited critical review of the relevant literature. Some attempt to construct a coherent argument, but may suffer loss of focus and consistency, with issues at stake stated only vaguely, or theoretical mode(s) couched in simplistic terms. Overall, Literature review part need to be improved.</p> <p>Methodology / Data Analysis - Arguments presented have minor flaws. There is some weakness in interpretation. Demonstrates an above average ability to articulate a critical response and an above average analysis of material. There is evidence of organisation and structure, but the inadequate coherence reflects a lack of insight and understanding. Demonstrates adequate levels of understanding and originality in the analysis of the research findings. There is limited evidence of personal insights into the field.</p> <p>Conclusion - The conclusions are partially logical and/or valid. They are communicated clearly. The final summary only partially communicates the purpose and findings of the study.</p> <p>Limitations and future directions are not discussed</p> <p>References - Referencing is not in line with the standard conventions in terms of format and layout.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Clear and correct use of English characterized by a very lucid style of expression, with no imprecise and/or incorrect statements. A simple basic style but with significant deficiencies in expression or format that may pose obstacles for the reader. Suggested to proofread before submission</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The academic standard of the paper is sufficient to merit a pass mark. The work, however, is in need of serious editing. The writing style and layout of the article require attention. There are omissions and linguistic and typographical errors. Editing and revision would improve the work and errors should definitely be rectified.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamalesh Ravesangar
Department, University & Country	Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology, Malaysia