



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_41089
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship Between Entrepreneurial Factors and Small Agro-Enterprises' Success: Evidence from Bhutan
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	Title of Manuscript : “Relationship Between Entrepreneurial Factors and Small Agro-Enterprises’ Success: Evidence from Bhutan” The manuscript is quite an interesting one on the relationship between entrepreneurial factors and Small Agro-Enterprises’ success in Bhutan. These are my few comments on this manuscript which was aimed at increasing the quality of the eventual research output; 1. The major findings of this study should be included in the abstract section. Like some vital information especially the results and discussion of this study be included, 2. The sampling and analytical procedures adopted among others should be reported. 3. You may have to do a rearrangement of the introduction section. The empirical review should be incorporated mainly in the heart of the introduction. The hypotheses testing should be written in a more conventional way showing or including both the non hypotheses and the alternative hypotheses. You also need to report the results of each of this hypothesis of this study. 4. This study need to have some kind of conspicuous statement of the problem and possibly research questions emanating from the research objectives. These are necessary aspects of this research. You may still add more literature review on the recent studies on the subject matter, at least the few ones available according to your claim of dearth of literature on this subject matter. 5. In your methodology are you making use of only Person correlation for this study? Please you can explore other analytical tools on this subject matter to improve the quality of this research. The only one table for this study is grossly inadequate.	1. As recommended, we presented r and p values. Also, we presented AR² in the abstract. 2. We reported the model adopted to measure success of SAEs and gave the reasons why we have chosen (see line 104-111). 3. We added rearranged the introduction and added whole second paragraph the literature review. As suggested we also added null hypothesis and alternate hypothesis. And each hypothesis is presented and discussed in separate sub-topics under result and discussion. 4. We added 10 more literature and now it is 55 increased from 45. We stated that lack of study in Bhutan as the problem statement. We also added a research question as ‘To what extent do entrepreneurial factors affect the success of SAEs in Bhutan’. 5. In addition to Pearson’s correlation, we performed multiple linear regression to predict the influence of independent variables. Thank you so much for making this comment. We could detect some error in calculating success score only while performing regression analysis and now we have corrected. Moreover, we removed training and education from the analysis as it violated some assumptions and conditions for Peason’s correlation and linear regression. However, we acknowledge in the paper that we have included education and training initially and removed later on. Hope reviewers will appreciate our HONESTY and EFFORTS towards improving the quality of article.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Also, you can include the geographical map of your study area for your readers to really see where your research is been carried out and add colour to your study. 7. In Results and discussion section, let table flow with its discussion. Do not refer to the Table (Y), just let each table of the discussion given follow that particular discussion. This will sustain the follow of reporting your research findings in a logical manner with clarity and gain better understanding by your readers. Also, you can support your findings with the use of previous empirical works positively or negatively. 8. The study did not have recommendations. Recommendations for policy implication should follow the conclusion section of this study and it should emanate from your research findings and not mere generalization. 9. The references used in this study are encouraging and adequate considering the numbers but should be sure that they are all readily retrievable by your readers. 10. Thank you.	6. We added study area exactly suggested by reviewer (see Fig 1) 7. We presented the Table first followed by discussions. Results and discussions were supported with earlier studies wherever possible. 8. We added recommendation for both relevant authorities and future researchers in the conclusions. 9. We added DOI so that it can be retrieved by the readers.
Minor REVISION comments	All minor corrections are already included in the corrected version of the main manuscript.	Incorporated
Optional/General comments	Nil	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>