

Paper: **“Obstacles to Development of Entrepreneurship in Pakistan”**

Submitted: 14 June 2023

Accepted: 23 February 2024

Published: 29 February 2024

Corresponding Author: Jovan Shopovski

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n4p52

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Antonio Solís Lima
Tecnológico Nacional de México México

Reviewer 2: Safae Laamrani El Idrissi
Ibn Tofail University, Morocco

Reviewer 3: Daniela Breveníková
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 4: Foldi Kata
University of Debrecen, Hungary

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Antonio Solís Lima	
University/Country: Tecnológico Nacional de México/ México	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/06/2023	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: OBSTACLES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN PAKISTAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0663/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input type="checkbox"/> /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 is clear and adequate to the content of the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>In the abstract were presented all the elements of the research.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are two similar questions, but with different content (Verify number 3). Also, it is recommendable that tables must be in APA style.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods were explained clearly in the methodology.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are not clear, because some questions were closed (Question 2, 4 and 5) and it is very difficult analyze and conclude some from them. Also, the sample must be supported through basic statistics in order to validate the results.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Because some of the results were not supported, some of the conclusions are not validated.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is advisable to carry out a basic statistical analysis to validate the study sample, and in this way to be able to confirm the findings, which seem to be very significant.

It is recommended that when preparing a questionnaire, the questions are opened and not closed, in order to obtain more information to answer the research question. Or, contrast the results obtained from the closed questions with the work of other researchers who have tried to solve a similar problem.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Dr Safae LAAMRANI EL IDRISSI	
University/Country: Ibn Tofail University / Morocco	
Date Manuscript Received: 15/06/2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 24/06/2023
Manuscript Title: OBSTACLES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN PAKISTAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0663/23	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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 to the content of the article.	4

<i>The title reflects the subject of this paper, addressing the concept of entrepreneurship, its distortion in Pakistan, and the obstacles resulting from government decisions and the involvement of SMEs in setting long-term goals.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Due to the decisions made by the Pakistani government, the concept of entrepreneurship has undergone a redefinition contrary to established theories. This paper is an extension of a previous paper cited as a reference.</i>	
<i>The author has also mentioned in the abstract the main obstacles (results) faced by SMEs in Pakistan in this research work. Finally, this paper provides recommendations to researchers/practitioners, entrepreneurs, and the government to ensure the growth of SMEs in Pakistan.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodology of this paper follows that of the previously cited paper published in 2016, which presented a comparative study among several countries.</i>	
<i>Indeed, this paper constitutes a comparative study between the previously collected and analyzed data from the first work, published in 2016, and the data collected in 2022.</i>	
<i>In this methodological section, the author specifies the number of respondents, the response rate, the sizes of the participating companies, their sector of activity, and other relevant details.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The findings are categorized into two sections.</i>	
<i>The initial section replicates the 2016 study, while the second section introduces new inquiries. The first part of the results attempts to evaluate the business environment for SME growth in the country from 2015 to 2022. The assessment indicates that the environment is deemed average but remains unfavorable for SME expansion, as evidenced by a substantial increase of negative responses by 717%. In response to these findings, the author suggests various activities that could facilitate the growth of SMEs in Pakistan.</i>	
<i>The second section focuses on inquiries regarding the collusion between civil servants and influential business figures, as well as the government's investments in fostering entrepreneurship. The results provide evidence that entrepreneurship cannot be effectively developed in Pakistan, as it contradicts established economic and business theories. Additionally, there are multiple reasons identified that hinder the growth of SMEs in Pakistan.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4

The conclusion highlights several key factors that impede the expansion of SMEs in Pakistan, including political instability, an inadequate legal system, and a lack of focus on entrepreneurship in public policy. Pakistani SMEs require increased emphasis on research and development across various fields and necessitate significant attention from the government and policymakers.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

5

APA citation respected; the references are appropriate.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

First and foremost, I would like to emphasize that the authors have conducted a research study that builds upon the previous study conducted in 2016. In order to make the questionnaire more tailored to the Pakistani entrepreneurship environment, the authors have included additional specific questions in the second part. This distinguishes it from the 2016 study, which primarily focused on comparing multiple countries.

However, there are a few areas where the authors could improve the clarity and precision of the description of the research methods and findings. For example:

- It would have been better if the researchers had initially defined a research problem before defining the 2 questions of research in the introduction.
- It would have been better if the researchers to add more questions to the second part of the survey and to work on specified sector of SMEs to describe the opportunities and hinders in this specific discipline.
- Overall, this is a strong research project that makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of the entrepreneurship expansion environment in Pakistan.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: Daniela Breveníková	
University/Country: Slovak Republic	
Date Manuscript Received: Feb. 12, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: February 15, 2024
Manuscript Title: OBSTACLES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN PAKISTAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 63.06.2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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 to the content of the article.	3

<p><i>The title of the paper could be extended. Types of obstacles or the consequences could be specified in the title of the paper.</i></p> <p><i>For example: Socio-economic and political obstacles to ... / Obstacles to development of entrepreneurship in Pakistan./ Obstacles to development of small and medium sized businesses in Pakistan./ or Factors affecting small business development in Pakistan.</i></p>	
<p>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>The abstract contains the required information about objects, methods and results of the research conducted.</i></p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>There are few grammatical errors. We recommend to correct obvious misprints, namely British spelling in the text written in American English (pp.4, 13, 14.)</i></p> <p>I suggest to reformulate the second sentence in the abstract: “It conducted interviews and group discussions with mid and senior levels managements of SMEs...”</p> <p>p.8. Use the term “standard of living” instead of <u>life standard</u>.</p> <p>Please, correct: The response of the firms on to question... This mistake occurs in the body text several times. (pp. 10, 11...)</p> <p>p. 13, Table 3:... Distribution has is the same ...</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>Methods applied in the study are clearly explained. The author used the combination of the interview and the questionnaire method to obtain data from respondents. The respondent sample is distinctly characterized.</i></p>	
<p>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p><i>Results of the respondents’ responses presented in tables and figures are explained and justified by the author.</i></p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>The conclusions correspond to the content of the research paper and are supported by the results of analysis. The author not only identifies the obstacles to Pakistan’s growth of economy but also gives recommendations to the government and other agents how to deal with the problems that are so clearly identified in the paper.</i></p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p><i>P. 5 : missing page number in the direct citation</i></p> <p><i>The way of writing in-text citation in the introductory part of the paper has to be unified.</i></p> <p><i>The references contain numerous relevant sources from various countries.</i></p>	

*I could not find source **Economist (1998)** in the body text.*

If there are 3 – 20 authors, names of all of them should be listed in the references according to APA Style, Edition 7 (Batrancea, Larissa, et al., 2022.)

Names of journals have to be italicized in the references.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): *The title of the paper could be extended. Types of obstacles or the consequences could be specified in the title of the paper.*

For example: Socio-economic and political obstacles to ... / Obstacles to development of entrepreneurship in Pakistan./ Obstacles to development of small- and medium-sized businesses in Pakistan./ or Factors affecting the development of small business in Pakistan.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

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: Kata Földi	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 11/02/2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/02/2024
Manuscript Title: OBSTACLES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN PAKISTAN	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0663/2023	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

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 of the article is correct and related to content.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract contains objects, methods and main results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. For example table 3. answer option excel – means excellent?</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The manuscript methods are explained clearly. I only missed the period of time of the questionnaire survey.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors. I only missed 5-point likert scale question the mean, standard deviation and relative standard deviation from table 2.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I missed the period of time of the questionnaire survey from methodology. I missed 5-point likert scale question the mean, standard deviation and relative standard deviation from table 2. I omitted the number of respondents from naming tables and figures of primary research results, for example: (N =).

On pages 8 and 9, the topics of the questionnaire should be indicated in a table, instead of box 1 structure of questionnaire.

Under the Figure 3: Current Environment for the growth of SMEs, %, the primary research results (answer options: bad, average, good, excel – it would be excellent?) compared with not current (2020) and not the same topic (Covid-19) literature references.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: