

Manuscript: “**Social Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Development: The Case of Social Enterprises in Azerbaijan**”

Submitted: 31 August 2020

Accepted: 13 April 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Nazila Aliyeva

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n12p39

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Davide Calandra, University of Turin, Italy

Reviewer 2: Brian Sloboda, University of Maryland, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 23/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/02/2021
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THE CASE OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISES IN AZERBAIJAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 46.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and adequate for the article’s content.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Please, add the main implications for the theory and practitioners of your paper. Few sentences. Thank you.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	No

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	Si
<i>Please, highlight how do you select the questions. From the literature, from your analysis? Give more insight into it. You could find interesting the following reading:</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>Findings are engaging and relevant. Thank you.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>At the end of the conclusion section, please give the main study's limitation and future research avenues for researchers. All the best for your research.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for significant revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In the literature review, I would also suggest considering:

Iannaci, D. (2020). Reporting tools for social enterprises: between impact measurement and stakeholder needs. *European Journal of Social Impact and Circular Economy*, 1(1b), 1-18.

Urmanaviciene, A. (2020). WISEs' Social Impact Measurement in the Baltic States. *European Journal of Social Impact and Circular Economy*, 1(2), 48-75.



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of

the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Brian W. Sloboda	
University/Country: United States	
Date Manuscript Received: March 1, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: March 8, 2021
Manuscript Title: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT THE CASE OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISES IN AZERBAIJAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 49 06 2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title for this paper is clear and represents the content of this paper very well.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract for this paper is good. After reading the abstract the reader will have a good idea what this paper will be about.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	

<i>The paper has numerous grammatical errors and spelling errors. The author(s) needs to carefully edit the paper while revising this paper. I attached the grammatical and spelling errors for this paper in a separate file for the author(s) to consider when revising their paper.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>There are comments on the study methods. Below are the comments on the study methods:</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author(s) stated that “This research adopts a qualitative methodological approach based on a triangulation of data sources, where the research approach implemented has been that of interpretivism.” The discussion how this was done in the paper is not very clear. The author(s) should layout step by step how this was done. 2. It is not too clear how ethnography was used in the study design in this paper. More specifically, what was the ethnographical approach used in this paper? The latter seems to be missing in this paper. 3. The research design used the interviews and a survey. The author(s) mentioned that the survey was pretested. From the latter, it appears that the author(s) did a pilot study before administering the survey. How was the pilot study conducted? Who was included in the pilot study? 4. How was the content of the interviews evaluated? That is, any particular software that was used to evaluate the content of the interviews to obtain any common themes etc? 5. How large was the sample that used in this study? How was this sample obtained in this study? 	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results in this paper are interesting. The discussion of these results are complete. In figure 7, what is series 1? The author(s) need to identify what the series 1 is.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The results of this study are complete. The research design of this study needs to be explained in greater depth than the current explanation.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate for this paper. There are errors in the preparation of the references and the author(s) should carefully edit the references during the revision process for this paper.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See my comment above concerning how to improve this paper.

