



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJ SSE_46234</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INTERROGATING THE IMPLICATIONS OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE ON ENTREPRENEURIAL PERFORMANCE: A DISCUSS</b>
Type of the 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>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>i. The introduction is brilliant and buoyant providing good direction for emotional intelligence and entrepreneur's performance.</p> <p>2. <b>RESEARCH DESIGN, MAIN ARGUMENT, AND STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY: this needs not be a sub theme.it could be incorporated as part of the introduction. Then3. Should take the place of 2. To commence conceptual framework or literature review.</b></p> <p>ii. The argument of the authors on the multiplier effects of emotional intelligence of entrepreneur's performance is quite logical from inferences drawn from literature as replicated in the work.</p> <p>Though clearly stated by authors the qualitative nature of the study is understood but completely void of the methodology section reflecting the qualitative approach. Therefore authors should clearly impute that aspect to make the work more robust.</p> <p>iii. The entire structure of the work should be re-worked and organized after the accepted journal structure before being published. The work is still in the raw project format.</p> <p>iv. The first line to the recommendation section should be looked at and adjusted.</p> <p>v. the reference section needs a little attention: references to be checked again for compliance to APA format.</p>	Corrections effected accordingly
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper demonstrates adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and as well authors cite appropriate range of literature sources. To this end the paper's argument built on appropriate theoretical base is apt. Therefore it should be accepted and re-structured for publication.	Thank you so much for your kind words, we greatly appreciate your effort towards the advancement of knowledge.

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

Kindly see the following link:



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

**PART 2:**

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	