

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Economics and Entrepreneurship
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3336.12
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF INCUBATION CENTRES AS AGENTS FOR SOCIAL INCLUSION
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The Incubation Centre is creating huge impact through the social enterprises it is nurturing. The incubation centres that will strengthen the ecosystem to encourage and sustain the work done by the social entrepreneurs/change leaders. The Incubation Centre will continue to develop strong networks and disseminate the knowledge on social entrepreneurship across sectors and across borders. Over the years, the Incubation Centres are increasingly viewed as the facilitators of social inclusion and inclusive growth. Hence, it has been an increasing focus on how society at large can gain or facilitate from the research activities of the academia and also how it can promote social and student entrepreneurship.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article has its technical robustness and soundness as because of its proceedings since abstract, introduction, backgrounds, reviews approaches of qualitative divisions, its potential, exposures, formalization, group diversities as motivation and patience, documentation and legalities like certification, fees & taxes, paperwork, location and resources such as decentralisation, on-site training, reduce migration & resources, followed by their marketing products and finally conclusion. All these measures are just, apt and appropriateness of the article. The qualitative approach and descriptions depicts its technical robustness and soundness of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes it is but a few more recent References must be included.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
Optional/General comments	A few graphs, pictures, schematic designs, figures may be included as if it have been taken into accounts during data collection or interviews.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunil Kumar Baskey
Department, University & Country	Rabindra Bharati University, India