



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJAEES_8265
Title of the Manuscript:	Social enterprises in the Irish rural space: an analysis in the area of Ballyhoura
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The subject matter of the article is interesting and relevant. It can significantly contribute to advances in the state of the art in the analysis of the impact of rural development policies. The authors clearly contextualise the role of Leader project and social enterprises in the integrated rural development policies for the Irish rural areas, Nevertheless the manuscript shows the weaknesses listed below: - Research aims and objectives are not reported. - An analysis of the relevant literature review is not presented by the autor/s. - Consequently, gaps in the state of the art are not highlighted and it is not clear what is the contribution of the research in light of these gaps. - The choice of the area of study is not adequately justified. Furthermore authors don't explain how results can be extended or compared to other case studies analysis. - A paragraph presenting material and methods is missing. - Results are not adequately supported by robust data and comparisons with previous research during discussions are missing.	I have put new sub paragraphs about aim of the paper and methodology as well.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In addition to compulsory comments:	According to the comments I modified the underscored parts.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The abstract should report in short: the motivation of the research, aims and objectives, methods, main results. Almost all these elements cannot be recognized. Paragraphs 1 and 2 should be merged and summarized. Authors explain in details well known concepts and emphasize history aspects not relevant for the research. On this basis the text between raw 87 and 136 should be substantial rewritten. Affirmations from raw 312 to 317 are not supported by data. Raw 336-338: general affirmation without any specification and data support. The same for raw 346-353 and raw 376-380. Raw 393-396 What kind of network? Is it referable to any model already treated by the literature? Raw 400: How did you calculate this amount? Raw 421-425: How can you support these affirmations?	It was impossible only, due to an extreme variety and number of social enterprises to insert a list of all social enterprises in the area of study.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper needs of a substantial revision to meet the standards required by the Journal guidelines. It presents relevant lacks in the theoretical background and the methodology. As a consequence also results don't present adequate scientific support.	I revised all parts in the paper and I have done a new structure of the paragraphs. I used new findings to justify some economic aspect in the paper.