

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_97916
Title of the Manuscript:	Measuring Female Leadership Competencies of SMEs
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. The authors are developing a female leadership competency instrument based on the Cogn & Thu (2020) framework and proposed dimensions.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. Please note that the study was not a "case study."</p> <p>No, the information on the methods is lacking.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes. However, the Methods section was incomplete. (missing - sampling method and procedures; need to discuss limitations).</p> <p>Yes, the references were appropriate and current.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is sufficient for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please see my comments on the manuscript for details.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please note that the study was not a "case study." Strengthen the methods section of the abstract. The Slovin technique is for sample size calculation. Please name and describe the sampling method. Did you have a probability or non-probability sample? Did you have inclusion/exclusion criteria? Carli (1999)'s systematic review concluded that "Women generally have greater difficulty exerting influence than men do, particularly when they use the influence that conveys competence and authority." (p. 81). The problem of women in leadership is not their skills. The problem perhaps relates to the gender differences in power and their effect on social influence. Women's elevation to top leadership positions is still low because of a multitude of reasons. Moreover, the feminine style of management is a management style generally characterized by more feminine quality soft skills and behaviors such as empathy, effective communication, and a generally more democratic or team-styled work environment. The style is a growing trend within businesses and is characterized by a form of transformational leadership style. Soft skills are important skills in leadership; therefore, it is not accurate or fair to say "Women's leadership and skills are still low." In the method section, you readers expect to see the procedures. What did the 100 participants do? How did you construct your instrument based on those dimensions and indicators? How many items were in your instrument? (I assume each indicator has its own item in your original instrument; you have to clarify it). Did you collect demographic data from your participants? Did you pilot your instrument beforehand? If so, what were the procedures? In the method section, did you mean "partial least squares regression"? SmartPLS3 is a software, and PLS is a statistical method. Please rewrite the sentence to accurately describe the methods. For the six (removed) items with load factor <0.7 (it helps to remind your readers of the predetermined threshold), how low were the values? 	

Review Form 1.7

	8. It is best to discuss any implications and next steps. What are you planning to do with those six items? 9. What were the limitations of your study? 10. You concluded that your instrument was "valid and reliable;" however, the truth was that it was only valid and reliable when those six items were excluded from the analysis.(Should you include something about the six items in your abstract?)	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tan Fung Ivan Chan
Department, University & Country	Barry University, USA