

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Economics and Entrepreneurship
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_ 3336.8
Title of the Manuscript:	SERVICE QUALITY AT DURBAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, CENTRE FOR SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP RAPID INCUBATOR
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.	The manuscript presents an excellent description of the incubator process with managerial sustainability, in addition to an excellent bibliographic reference.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title represents what will be observed throughout the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract presents the reader with what they will find throughout the manuscript. However, I present some suggestions for grammatical improvements.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it has an adequate and logical distribution throughout the text, leading the reader to conclude the context of incubators in South Africa.	
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.	Although it has a great logical and scientific sequence, I made several suggestions for grammatical improvements, for better understanding by the reader.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	bibliographical references were included in the manuscript, which are not included at the end in the References, as indicated throughout the text.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Although it has a great logical and scientific sequence, I made several suggestions for grammatical improvements, for better understanding by the reader.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Luiz Roberto Nascimento
Department, University & Country	ENS-Brazilian School of Insurance, Brazil