

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_109397</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Comparative Analysis of the contribution of Entrepreneurship to Women's Well-Being and Sustainability: The Case of India and Tunisia</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript <i>entitled</i> "A Comparative Analysis of the contribution of Entrepreneurship to Women's Well-Being and Sustainability: The Case of India and Tunisia" is important for scientific community. This is because the findings of relevant studies offer a way out of poverty for families, foster the development of communities, and provide a route to modernizing countries globally in the long run.</p> <p>2. The title is not self-explanatory. It should be rewritten for better sound and for self-explanatory. It can be written as follows:  A Comparative Analysis of Entrepreneurship-contributions to Women's Well-Being and Sustainability: A Case Study of India and Tunisia</p> <p>3. After briefly laying down the foundation of the topic / study, the abstract contains a brief background, and the declaration of techniques or methods that are used are missing in the study. Thus, the choices of the authors make the paper to be scientific. So, the Abstract appears to be good.</p> <p>4. All subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate are not perfect. For example, the authors should follow the standard format such Introduction, Literature Review etc.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct but needs to further edit the text for connecting each paragraph.</p> <p>6. , Yes, the references used in the Reference Section are good and recent, however, author needs to use the more references in the text.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, English language quality is good and suitable for scholarly communications here. But it is not excellent.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Authors need to do further editing and connecting the tone of paragraphs. In other words, each paragraph should be connected. Also, at the end of the Introduction, author needs to spell out where the study is going. Also, the author should add a justification of choosing India and Tunisia as a case study. Also, it would be better to justify why not only India or why the both countries etc.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Akim M. Rahman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ahsanullah University of Science and Technology, Social and Economic Research Institute, Bangladesh, The Ohio State University, USA</b>