



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19670
Title of the Manuscript:	SMEs Growth Influencers: An exploratory study on the impact of entrepreneur character traits on SMEs Growth in 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	- The paper is difficult to read: needs proper structure (some new headlines would suffice sometimes: like 'performance and SMEs growth': the way it is presented in the paper, it looks as if it is another hypothesis you intend to develop and test, but in fact it is your main motivation! Same with 'Entrepreneurs characteristics and growth of SMEs' – which is more of an intro to the discussion of the hypotheses) - Hypotheses: the authors should mention the direction of significance that are expected (positive or negative!). - Section 3: repetitive parts – 3 and 3.3 are very similar and therefore redundant - Analytical methods: here, the authors really need to be more explicit as what it is they are actually doing and why! So they conduct a FA to identify factors that affect a SMEs innovativeness only (line 278)? - It is a very long section and honestly, very difficult to read and understand. There should be a better way to present the results: maybe in a table?. - Furthermore, in line 316 the authors refer to three factors only but for the rest of the section they discuss 5 factors? - The authors mention a pattern matrix in the text (line 320). Where is it? - Same, scree plot? Where is it?	The author agrees with most of the comments made by the reviewer and the suggestions. The direction of the hypothesis have been restated as suggested. The other factors identified in the FA has been included in the text Line 316 the authors set a criterion to maintain variables with eigenvalues of 3 or greater. Therefore, authors maintained 5



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Table 3 comes out of the blue – the authors want the reader to understand and read their paper – and should therefore make clear what they are doing and why! The authors should provide a brief introductory section/sentence here! - Spearman’s correlation: results can be discussed more briefly (no need to discuss the strength and direction of correlation separately). Anyway, the authors provide a systematic statistical test later on. - Table 4 – comes out of the blue again. The authors should mention what they do, why and what it shows. - Honestly, I do not at all understand what is tested and presented in Table 4. What exactly is the dependent variable? Where is the control variable ‘need to achieve’? Are the controls also ordinal? If so, which categories were defined (how come so many controls are ‘redundant’)? - The authors should be aware that they are not establishing any causality (as claimed in line 279) – only correlation!	variables which have eigenvalues greater of 3 or greater. Table 3 is a correlation analysis to find out the relationship between the variables understudy. The authors has introduced the objective of Table 3 and briefly discussed the correlation. Table 4 is a regression analysis to found out the impact of the predictor variables on the criterion variable. There is a brief introduction to explain the purpose as suggested. The authors are measuring relationship and not causality. The suggestions have been dealt with accordingly.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Could it be that SMEs self select into regional capitals (abler entrepreneurs establish their ventures in the capital with more competition): the issues of self-selection and selection bias need to be addressed. - Any policy conclusions that can be inferred from the results? - What is new about the paper – needs to be highlighted. - Language check!	The matrix table was omitted for lack of space. It's too large and needs more pages. Also clear explanation have been given to the sector per the recommendations of the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Maybe a better motivation why this type of research is of interest – particularly in Ghana?!	On the implication of the research to Ghana have the author have included it.