

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Economics and Entrepreneurship
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_ 3336.14
Title of the Manuscript:	The role of entrepreneurship education in KwaZulu-Natal government-funded high schools on fostering entrepreneurial mindsets and skills in South Africa
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This study contributes to a broader exploration of the effectiveness of educational interventions in fostering an entrepreneurial mindset, particularly in developing countries. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive literature review and its focus on practical implications, providing concrete suggestions for curriculum improvement. However, the analysis would have benefited from a deeper exploration of the reasons behind the observed trends. This would have strengthened the link between the data and its wider implications for educational policy and practice. Overall, this manuscript is a valuable contribution that, with a little refinement, could have an even greater impact on the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article, "The Role of Entrepreneurship Education in KwaZulu-Natal Government-Funded High Schools on Fostering Entrepreneurial Mindsets and Skills in South Africa," is suitable.However, it might be slightly lengthy; a more concise alternative could be: "Entrepreneurship Education in KwaZulu-Natal High Schools: Fostering Skills and Mindsets."	
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.	Recommendations for improvement Focus on the main findings: Focus on the main findings Clarify the problem: A brief reference to specific challenges facing KwaZulu-Natal, such as high unemployment, could better illustrate why this study is necessary. Streamline recommendations: Recommendations can be summarized in a single sentence, highlighting key areas for improvement, such as curriculum design, educator training and institutional support. Reduce length: Consider reducing the length of the abstract by eliminating repetitive phrases or overly detailed explanations. Focus on the substance and implications of the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are mostly appropriate, but there are areas where refinement could enhance clarity and coherence. Here's a breakdown of the evaluation: <b>1. Introduction</b> The introduction effectively sets the context and presents the research problem. However, the flow could be improved by clearly separating the background, problem statement, and objectives into distinct subsections. This would make it easier for readers to follow the rationale behind the study. Suggested Subsections: Consider adding subsections like "Background," "Problem Statement," "Objectives," and "Significance of the Study" within the introduction to provide a clearer structure. <b>2. Literature Review</b> The literature review is well-developed and provides a solid foundation for the study. However, it could benefit from clearer subheadings to distinguish between different themes or theoretical perspectives related to entrepreneurship education. Suggested Subsections: Consider breaking the literature review into smaller sections, such as "Definition and Scope of Entrepreneurship Education," "Importance in Developing Countries," and "Challenges in Implementation."	

Review Form 2

	<p><b>3.Methodology</b> The methodology section is appropriately detailed in terms of the research design, data collection, and sampling. However, it lacks a subsection discussing the statistical analysis procedures, which are crucial for understanding how data will be analyzed. Suggested Subsections: Add a "Data Analysis" subsection to outline the statistical tools and techniques used, including any tests for reliability and validity.</p> <p><b>4. Results</b> The results section effectively presents the data, but it could be structured more clearly by grouping similar findings under thematic subheadings. This would help distinguish between different areas of analysis, such as educators' perceptions, key skills developed, and institutional support. Suggested Subsections: Use subheadings like "Educators' Perceptions," "Key Entrepreneurial Skills," and "Role of Public Institutions" to organize the results more logically.</p> <p><b>5. Discussion</b> The discussion section should not only summarize the findings but also interpret them in the context of existing literature and theory. It could be structured with specific subsections to address each research question or objective. Suggested Subsections: Consider subsections like "Implications for Entrepreneurship Education," "Challenges and Opportunities," and "Comparison with Previous Studies."</p> <p><b>6. Conclusion and Recommendations</b> The conclusion is well-presented, summarizing the main findings and offering recommendations. However, separating the conclusion and recommendations into distinct sections can make the structure clearer. Suggested Subsections: Use separate sections for "Conclusion" and "Recommendations" to distinguish between summarizing the study's findings and suggesting future actions.</p> <p><b>Overall Structural Suggestions</b> : Adding more distinct subsections throughout the manuscript will enhance readability and ensure that each part of the research is clearly presented. This structured approach will also make it easier for readers to navigate and understand the manuscript's content.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it is grounded in a well-defined research problem relevant to the context of South African high schools, specifically focusing on the role of entrepreneurship education. The study employs a cross-sectional design, which is appropriate for exploring relationships between variables, and the use of quantitative data collection ensures objectivity in measuring educators' perceptions and the impact of educational interventions. The manuscript also draws from an extensive body of literature, aligning its theoretical foundation with established research on entrepreneurship education, which enhances the credibility of the findings. However, the scientific rigor could be further strengthened by incorporating reliability and validity analysis, ensuring the robustness of the measurement tools used.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally adequate, covering a wide range of materials related to entrepreneurship education, including basic research and relevant theories. However, while some of the references are up-to-date, others are somewhat outdated, with several sources dating back to the early 2000s. Given the dynamic nature of entrepreneurship education, the inclusion of more recent research would help to better understand current trends and challenges.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear articulation of the research objectives, findings, and recommendations.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>With a few modifications, this manuscript has the potential to meaningfully influence the debate on entrepreneurship education in developing countries.</p>	

Review Form 2

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:	Li Bo
Department, University & Country	Henan University of Urban Construction, China, Universiti Tun Abdul Razak, Malaysia