SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2012/BJEMT/2470**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Gender Differences in Human Capital and Personality Traits as Drivers of Gender Gap in Entrepreneurship: Empirical Evidence from Nigeria**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	Although the style of the article is appropriate for the nature of the readership of an academic journal, and it is well written and well presented in terms of language, I would recommend a major revision before publication. The subject is important and the research design is appropriate. However, the article gives little original contribution for the research field of gender gap in entrepreneurship, being the literature review quite poor. The article needs significant literature review in general, and especially in the context of "Social capital". This paper needs a section to address the networking research in women business in detail, eg see references down, and how this article is situated in relation to the following and other works. In particular, I would recommend the following references: 1. Kuada, John (2009) "Gender, Social Networks, and Entrepreneurship in Ghana". *Journal of African Business*, 10, 1: 85-103 2. Burt, R. (2006) "The gender of Social	

	Capital". The international library of Entrepreneurship series, 2. 3. Rodríguez, M.J. & Santos, F.J. (2009) "Women Nascent entrepreneurs and Social Capital in the process of firm creation" *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 5, 1: 45-64 4. Neergaard, H., Shaw, E., & Carter, S. (2005) "The impact of gender, social capital and networks on business ownership: a research agenda", International *Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 11 Iss: 5, pp.338 – 357 5. Liñán, F., & Santos, F. J. (2007). Does social capital affect entrepreneurial intentions? *International Advances in Economic Research, 13*(4). 6. Brush, CG. Bruin, A., Welter, F. (2009) "A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship", *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship,* Vol. 1 Iss: 1, pp.8 – 24 7. Baron, R. & Markman, G. (2009) "Beyond social capital: How social skills can enhance entrepreneurs´success" *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal.* Volume 5, Issue 1, pp 45-64 8. Carter, N. (2006). "Women entrepreneurs who break through to equity financing: The influence of human, social and financial	

	capital" Venture Capital, 5.1. Also, if you are examining gender gap in entrepreneurship, you cannot overlook to mention Minniti (2009; 2010), Bird & Brush (2002), Verheul, Stel and Thurik (2004; 2006) or Ahl (2006; 2010). Furthermore, the empirical section (including methodology and result) is not coherent, and rigorous, nor well built. 1. The sample employed would not be representative enough as the author does not clarify the entrepreneur population existing in the study area. 2. I do not find sufficient justification for the choice of owners or managers of the businesses with a minimum of two employees. Why two and not one? 3. Overall results are not sufficiently substantiated or clearly presented. So there are statements in 4.1 that are not justified at all, providing no data or bibliography reference. Example: Line 272/273 *"Indicates the data collected ... in spite of the fact that women dominate the informal sector of the economy",* line 275/277 *"However ... women tend to be lower",* line 285/288, *"The study found several factors .... which are determinants of entrepreneurship"* or line 299/305 *" Access to finance…".* It is unclear whether the statement	

	is taken from the literature on women entrepreneurs, whether it relates to the Nigerian women entrepreneurs, or just within the survey of this work. Some references are needed here. 4. Results are not clearly presented and not property analysed as "test of hypotheses". Discussion and conclusions are not based on actual tables. Further rework is required regarding the presentation of the result and tables. The survey must be known in order to understand the results. 5. The conclusion is not supported by the data discussed within the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**María José Rodríguez Gutiérrez**
Department, University & Country	Dept. of Applied Economics University of Seville, Seville, Spain