



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	The article is more relevant for a new letter or popular magazine than academic journal for some reasons (1) Lack of focus. There are a number of new concepts that the author tried to propose. Consequently, the literature review will not able to support all concepts with comprehensive way. On the other word, the paper has poor literature review. My suggestion: focus to one concept with deep literature analysis. Begins with the title. It should focus on one issue. (2). There is lack of methodology. I suggest two alternative approaches: (1) to combine between qualitative and qualitative method to deal with one proposed concept. (2) Enhance more comprehensive qualitative approach, such as grounded theory or multiple case studies.	It's more relevant now 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 title is changed The methodology section is also revised to include more details of population, sample, industries rate...etc
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		