

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_102688
Title of the Manuscript:	Women Entrepreneurship: An Instinctive Approach or Stroke of Luck
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/SAJSSSE/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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript should be more accurate. Sometimes, it can be general.</p> <p>2. It is</p> <p>3. It isn't. The abstract should be more accurate in terms of the objective, procedures to analyse data, instruments and main results.</p> <p>4. It is.</p> <p>5. The manuscript needs serious adjustments. Please, check the comments suggested in the paper.</p> <p>6. The references are not good enough to support the study.</p> <p>In the document attached with this format, I kindly suggested some comments to take into consideration in order to improve the paper. Feel free to add them or reject them.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This is okay.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please, check out some biased comments such as "Women are home maker" and generalizations with no theoretical or fundamental basis, along the paper.</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:	William Ricardo Ortiz Garcia
Department, University & Country	Universidad Distrital Francisco José Caldas, Colombia