

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_88404
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Entrepreneurship Financing Methods on Collective Participation In knowledge-based businesses
Type of the Article	Review

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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Referencing is not following any style. I recommend to follow APA (Try https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html) 2. Use major referencing from good quality online sources. (https://scholar.google.com/) 3. Abstract should include, Methods, Objectives and Findings 4. The Methodology does not use any systematic way of addressing the issues (Use research onion - https://gradcoach.com/saunders-research-onion/). The collective modeling method, that is referred, practically is a technique of collecting data. This is not sufficient to explain the Method of organizing the work. 5. There is lack of clear theoretical framework. It seems that writer uses the 'the collective modeling method' as a framework. Framework should have its base in Theory and previous works. While it is referred to in the reference list, is far from utilizing some kind of it. 6. There is no specific explanation how she develops the 9 questions. If the questions are rendered, it should be referenced. Additionally, there is no explanation on how she comes into the results presented in the 2 tables. What is the sample size, what is the questionnaire etc. 7. In General I missed the answers in foundation issues like WHAT, HOW and WHY. 8. Conclusion is not a wish list for the future it should summarize the results on the basis of WHAT explained in the introduction. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Fix the format and abstract according to APA style and in text citation using better Harvard Referencing (Author-Date) standard. Use quotes whenever you copy small parts of text.	
Optional/General comments	There is a high need for assistance to the writer. He has done some effort but he is far from delivering a scholastic paper. He needs to follow some general guidelines.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Georgios Palaiologos
Department, University & Country	University of Belige, Belize