



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_50052
Title of the Manuscript:	Employment generation and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria: The Role of Social Entrepreneurship
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>



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Abstract</p> <p>2. Introduction</p> <p>3. Methodology</p> <p>4. Discussion</p>	<p>1. In the abstract, author should concentrate only on the problem, main objective, methodology, key findings and implications, then suggestion. All these are to be presented concisely and logically.</p> <p>2. The introduction is lengthy and failed to show the rationale of the paper, state studies that were conducted in the area of study and how gaps are identified in the last paragraph (line 59-63), and then how the paper is structured or organized.</p> <p>3. Author need to insert the correlation and regression models in form of equations with variables of interest to improve on the quality of the paper.</p> <p>4. In the discussion part, author used tables directly from SPSS output tables. Author should use summary academic tables to present the coefficients of the key variables with their respective t-statistics or standard errors and significance level.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Author should consider reading the paper from abstract to conclusion, to improve on its quality in terms of logical presentation of arguments and grammar.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Umar Muhammad Gummi
Department, University & Country	Sokoto State University, Nigeria