



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25512
Title of the Manuscript:	TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION AND SUSTAINABLE ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: STAKEHOLDERS' IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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	i. In analysis part, simple percentages were used to conclude which is inadequate to identify the relationship between technology innovation and sustainable entrepreneurship development. Multivariate analysis like factor analysis and multiple regression might be the useful techniques to explore the relationships; ii. In methodology part, more explanation of the respondents and the statistical techniques are required; iii. Sampling design is absent; iv. The formula used in lines 130-179 do not have any link with the literature and the topic of the research. v. Outdated references.	Multivariate analysis such as multiple regression would have been appropriate. However, it is not used due to lack of up-to-date time series secondary data, which will result to unreliable and misleading estimates that are practically incorrect. Already given sir/madam Sampling design now included More linkage is established References now up-dated
Minor REVISION comments	i. Tables may be placed in the appendix part of the paper; ii. Line 120 & 121 are unnecessary, may be deleted; iii. Line 180 – f is mistakenly written in front of Equity word; iv. Line 211 – 'source' of the diagram is to be given.	Adjustments made to table and figures as suggested by other reviewers as well Lines 120 & 121 already adjusted. Now corrected, thanks. Source of the diagram already provided
Optional/General comments		