



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_17413
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender and Small business Growth Orientations: Theory, Evidence and Implications for Ghana
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 (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	1) I don't agree at all with the phrase of author "A combination of purposive and random techniques was used in sampling respondents in the various communities" (270 row). The author has to clarify which exactly methodology used (random sampling, systematic sampling, etc.). 2) The methodology is not (so much) motivating from theory background. 3) I don't know if the author has license of copyrights to use the Figure "Business Motivating Factor" (371 row) or not. If yes, must be approved, because in different occasion it is plagiarism. If this Figure was created the author has to declare it, because I don't see any source down of it. The analysis is good but I prefer more clear conclusions. Maybe there is a problem with Figure (371 row). I ask from the author to tell if it is his work or if not, to prove that he/she has license about copyrights.	The reviewers English has a problem. I did not understanding well what he was trying to say. I have tried to do what is right to satisfy him/her on this score. This was created by the author as referred to in the text, which I suspect was not read by the reviewer. Some clarity made
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		