



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10135
Title of the Manuscript:	Unforeseen Challenges Facing Entrepreneurs in the UAE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	1. Problem statement is very vague. Does not bring out the real problem of focus. Lacks clarity. A reference made on Malit & Oliver 2013 (but stated in the reference 2012)—is it an article, book or thesis? This reference is just as a basis of the research quest in the problem statement. 2. The literature review is very shallow and lacks critical analysis on the subject matter. Some parts of the argument in the literature in taken directly from textbook, mimicking a leisure reading text more than an academic research. 3. The methodology section lacks scientific rigour. Since the author mentioned "participants were randomly selected", discussions on population, sampling frame, and sampling method are missing. The respondents profile is not discussed in the write up. Discuss also the interview protocol utilised in the structured qualitative interview mentioned on page 6. 4. How is data analysed? Is it via thematic analysis? Elaboration on findings is very shallow. 5. Conclusion lacks critical analysis of the findings. Very superficial. 6. Check references. A lot of missing information and	Problem statement now is very clear Reference of Oliver has been corrected The study is based on Evidence-Based Practice. So it's obvious to have poor literature review. However, the paper has been revised to strengthen the literature review section The methodology section is also revised to include more details about the population, sample, and the industries. Fixed References checked (Journal guidelines)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	lacks meticulousness.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	ALL MAJOR as stated above.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, this paper requires MAJOR reworking before it is ready for publication in BJEMT. It lacks scientific rigour and the work does not demonstrate sound academic writing.	