

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_99902
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of entrepreneurial characteristics on decision making process
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes, the topic is of a high interest for the research and general society.  Yes.  Yes, the abstract is ok.  Yes, the parts are logically presented.  Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.  The list of references does not exist in this article. However, some works are cited in the text.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is ok. There are some misprints: - Form or from the table? - Were furnishes or furnished?	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It would be great - To present the list of references - To make conclusions based on the study findings	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jelena Zascerinska</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centre for Education and Innovation Research, Latvia</b>