

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95650
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital marketing and entrepreneurship in women of El Porvenir district, 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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This paper examines an interesting and important topic. The title adequately describes the content of the article. The article includes all the relevant sections, and the conclusions are based on empirical analyses. Some minor comments are listed below.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>A. "According to" and "Regarding the" These two phrases are repeated several times. Perhaps, some editing is recommendable.</p> <p>B. Table 1 title is in Spanish language " Tabla 1. Emprendimientos de mujeres en el distrito El Porvenir 2022"</p> <p>C. Other specific comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> "No sampling was carried out because we worked with the entire population." Page 5. Statistical analysis uses sample information about some characteristic (statistic) to make inferences about the same characteristic (parameter) in the universe (population). If you are using the entire population, I do not think you should use statistical tests. It is correct to use the Spearman rank correlation coefficient to examine the association between the variables of interest in the population. However, it would be best if you revised the appropriateness of the statistical testing procedure. This procedure assumes that data come from a random sample or a stochastic process in the case of time series data. This case study may have implications for the whole country (Perú) or other countries. Thus, this would be the relevant inference. The author (s) should think about this point. " In Table 2, the probabilistic level $p=0.000 < 0.05$ significance level, therefore, the null hypothesis of normality was rejected. " page 6 Under the assumption that you have a sample: if the variables in the model are not normal, what probabilistic distribution are you using for the other tests? The author (s) should think about this point. "It was concluded that the data do not follow a normal distribution at a significance level of 0.05." page 6 Implications of this result? Is this normality test valid for ordinal variables? Can discrete (not continuous) ordinal variables be distributed Gaussian? " Table 3 shows, as a result, a probabilistic value $p = 0.000 < 0.01$ significance value, concluding that digital marketing has a highly significant impact on business entrepreneurship in women in the El Porvenir 2022 district." Page 6 This result is based on the Spearman correlation coefficient. Thus, this implies an association between these two indicators but does not determine the direction of 	

Review Form 1.7

	the causality. Some theory is needed to justify the direction of the causality (the distinction between dependent and explanatory variables) The author (s) should think about this point.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wilfredo Toledo
Department, University & Country	United States