

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_97481
Title of the Manuscript:	Will Emotional Intelligence Contribute to Entrepreneurial Success of FIRO (Federal Institute of Industrial Research Oshodi) Technology Adoptees in South West Geopolitical Zone Nigeria?
Type of the 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/SAJSSE/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The paper deals with a very interesting topic, and it included interesting ideas. However, I have the following comments that hopefully help the authors improve their paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The structure (outline) of the paper could be given at the end of the introductory chapter. I suggest that the authors add a research method diagram. This will provide a snapshot of the research steps followed and will help the reader in a clearer understanding of the paper. The literature review must be better contextualized and be more convincing. A more critical literature review should be presented to ground your study more firmly within what we already know on the topic. I would strongly encourage authors to provide a summary table of comprehensive literature review that will not only identify the gaps in the literature but also strengthen the contribution of this work. It would be nice to see some kind of conceptual framework for this research. In relation to section Materials and Method, the research methodology is not very clear, I recommend that you include an explanatory diagram in which you could enumerate every step taken in your paper in a summary way. What are the limitations of the study in terms of the proposed method, data used, approaches, and/or analysis? The main contribution of this paper should be compared with other similar empirical studies. How the results of this study can be generalized to other regions/countries. The authors should convince the readers, that their contribution is so important. These issues deserve a deeper discussion: What are the implications for theory and practice? What are the managerial implications from this research? How does this understanding help organizations to make better decisions? How decision or policy makers could benefit from this study. It could be interesting to discuss in the conclusion part, the future work, several potential futures research should be addressed. <p>I wish the author(s) all the best for their research and that these comments will be useful to them in improving the paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As usual a final thorough proof-reading is recommended. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	António Abreu
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic Institute of Lisbon, Portugal