



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	Line 11 if the study is only on central Nigeria then revisit the topic Line 13 too broad try to be more focus Line 23 to 85 you can sum or even omit this part Line 86 this should form part of the introduction, try to link entrepreneurship with the technological innovation with empirical evidence from developed and zoom to Nigeria Line 112-113 are you sure there is no technological innovation at all in the study area..? inadequate will be appropriate to replace lack,,, Line 123-124 justify the objectives since there may be other factors limiting the performance of entrepreneurship in Nigeria Line 128-129 check and change the heading Line 163 citations are very old, you can support or counter with current literatures Line 180 please why this table,,,? Line 213 please provide source of this table Line 380 too general Please see the attached file	Correction added sir. This is an important observation please see corrections in yellow label in main document. Line 86 is already part of the introduction. The link with technology innovation and entrepreneurship is linked, with empirical evidence from some developed countries and Nigeria in subsequent sections. Lines 112-113 have been corrected. The objectives are now justified; please refer to main doc. Thanks. We checked and modified the heading under lines 128-129. Lines 163, up-dated references are added, sir. Tables have been explained and re-numbered, please check the yellow ink, and sources of figures and tables are provided in line 180, 213 and line 380 adjusted.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The idea is good but not clear, too general and lack proper direction. Too much history and not focus, The ideas are ok but need to be sharp. The gap to fill is	The gap filled is now sharpened, ideas linked. We felt the empirical review covers both the brief history. The latter justifies our claim in Nigeria's rich entrepreneurship background that is now extinct. However, we may delete if



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not clear.	the length of article is too long. Thank you very kindly for this objective review.
--	------------	---