



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19934
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES IN THE BUSINESS RESCUE INDUSTRY IN UGANDA
Type of the Article	Opinion 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 28-64: Sebikari (2015) is the only author cited, and several times. This is not commendable for an opinion article. Such an article should draw its arguments from an array of authors, with strong international scientific reputation in the field. Line 70: "Entrepreneurship literature has acknowledged that enterprises fail most often because ..." At least 3 outstanding authors in the field should be cited, with a 10-year distance between their publications, e.g. 1990, 2000, 2010. Line 80-156: Apparently, Sebikari (2015) is the only reference this opinion article has relied on. This is not commendable. 93-105: Who appoints the BRP and when? Is this applicable to small-scale enterprises in Uganda?	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 29: "As" instead of "as". Line 46-48: Uganda Investment Authority is repeated. Line 66: "they are credited" instead of "this is credited". Line 69: "honesty" instead "honest" Line 74: "According to Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2011 findings" Line 75: "the Word Bank Group ease of doing business 2015 ranks..." Rather write "The World Bank Group's report "ease of doing business 2015" ranks..." 76-78: Several punctuation errors. Line 86: "by court order" instead of "curt order". HAVE THE ARTICLE THOROUGHLY CORRECTED FOR VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR ERRORS BY A NATIVE ENGLISH WRITER.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper looks like a report from a lecture note of Sebikari (2015). It does not bring enough insights on why Ugandan authorities should put emphasis on business rescue rather than business incubation for young entrepreneurs, knowing that the country's entrepreneurial tissue is made mostly of small-scale enterprises. Authors should have shown the relative contribution to GDP of existing different types of enterprises (small, medium, big; formal vs. informal; crude/raw products businesses vs. manufactured goods businesses) in Uganda, and provide evidence on how successful business rescue has been so far. What makes the difference in the rescue of a failing enterprise? The BRP or some intrinsic characteristics of enterprises or the business environment? Which types of enterprises provided clear positive rescue outcomes and useful lessons for policy-makers?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Barthélemy G. Honfoga</i>
Department, University & Country	Dept. of Agricultural economics and rural sociology, University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin