



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_31399
Title of the Manuscript:	APPROACH TO ASSESS AND SELECT SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES (SMEs) FOR INCUBATION ON THE BASE OF ANGEL MODEL – a case on developing economies and ENGINE program
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	This research paper is well organized. In addition, the author(s) have provided lots of literature to supports the findings and have done a well literature review. For the methodology, the author(s) have explained in details. The bellows are some suggestions: 1. Please shorten the abstract. 2. How did the author(s) derive the 5 research questions? 3. The author(s) have identified the “statement of the problem” (page 2), and the purpose of the purpose of the research (page 8). There are a little bit ambiguous for me. For the data collection, this study was gathered through questionnaire, face-to-face and phone interviews. For my understanding, the author(s) have adopted two types of the methods “questionnaire” and “interviewing” . Please explain the reasons in details.	1. The abstract has been shortened 2. The questions were derived base on the identified problems (as stated in statement the problem), and in an attempt to find solutions to the problems. 3. The purpose of this research and the statement of the problem have been worked on to make it understandable. 4. this has now been well-explained Thank you
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		