

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_107459
Title of the Manuscript:	The Contribution of Innovation Spaces Processes on The Performance of Early-Stage Enterprises in Iringa-Tanzania
Type of the Article	Original research

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>Yes, it presents the interesting results for the entrepreneurship development among early-stage entrepreneurs.</p> <p>Yes, it discloses the manuscript content.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract contains all the necessary information.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript structure is logical.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically written.</p> <p>The list of references includes 53 published works. The main problem of this manuscript is that the list of references does not reflect the published works cited in the text of the manuscript. The list of references presents only 5 in-text cited publications from 53 used in the list of references while 65 in-text cited sources are not shown in the list of references. Moreover, the 65 in-text cited sources are not very recent. The latest published work used for citation belongs to 2021. Today is year 2023.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The use of English is ok.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Abbreviation "PCA: is not explained. In the text hypothesis is first analysed, then, the detailed description of hypothesis is given. In this terms, the manuscript is not well-thought.</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:	Jelena Zascerinska
Department, University & Country	Centre for Education and Innovation Research, Latvia