

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_127043
Title of the Manuscript:	The Entrepreneurial Mindset: Views and Perspectives of Cacao Entrepreneurs on Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Bicol Region, Philippines
Type of the Article	Original Research

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Agriculture remains highly important for everyone in this world. Therefore, the submitted manuscript devoted to the analysis of innovation and entrepreneurship with the focus on the cacao farming sector is topical and timely. The submitted manuscript helps identify parameters limiting the cacao sector and measure for overcoming these barriers. The manuscript also provides useful recommendations for the optimisation of the cacao sector.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate as it allows identifying the field of study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive as it contains all the necessary elements such as introduction, methods, results, and conclusions. The abstract is well-formulated and easy to read.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is logically built and well-structured.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust as it reveals the description of methodology. For data analysis, scientific methods are used. Conclusions are built on the study findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The references are sufficient and recent. However, some references shown in the list of references are not cited in the correct way, e.g. instead of the author surname, the author's name is given. There are some publications authored by the same authors and issued in the same year. When citing, these publications are not differentiated by a letter A or B as it is accepted in the scientific world. In some cases, only first author is indicated although the work was published by a group of authors.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality is ok Page 2: "...this data includes..." should be "...these data include"...	
Optional/General comments	There are several abbreviations used in the text of the manuscript, e.g. CBSUA, VLIROUS, etc. They are not explained in full words. There are some paragraphs that are repeated word to word. The text around Figures 2 and Figure 3 is not readable as it is covered by these Figures. In-text citation is not formatted in the correct way. Reference should appear after the cited extract but not at the end of the whole paragraph.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

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