



Paper: **“Family Entrepreneurship in the Local Economic Structure: A Study in Ecuador”**

Submitted: 07 May 2025

Accepted: 20 June 2025

Published: 30 June 2025

Corresponding Author: Victor Dante Ayaviri-Nina

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n16p23

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Daniela Brevenikova
University of Economics, Slovakia

Reviewer 2: Robert Szucs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Slovakia	
Date Manuscript Received: 4 June 2025	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Family entrepreneurship in the local economic structure: A study in Ecuador	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06.51.05.2025	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The paper deals with the impact of family entrepreneurship on the economic production of the Guano canton, province of Chimborazo, Ecuador. The title corresponds to the content of the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract contains a summary of the information required , i.e. objects, methods and results.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The paper does not contain grammatical errors.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5	
<i>Authors present the study methods applied in the paper clearly and in a well-arranged manner.</i> <i>The questionnaire method is used to collect data; its structure is succinctly described. For data processing and hypothesis testing, SPSS software was used. Hypothesis testing was performed through multinomial logistic regression and multiple linear regression. The method and instruments of analysis and testing are adequate.</i>		
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5	
<i>The results are clearly presented and supported with verifications. Statistical methods were used to verify the results of analysis.</i>		
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4	
<i>Challenges as well as opportunities of family entrepreneurship in the location described are presented in the paper. The authors conclude that their analysis supports the assertion related to the impact of family entrepreneurship on the productive economic structure of Guano Canton. The authors recommend to involve all the stakeholders in a continuous and coordinated implementation of “a set of support and mentoring actions”, i.e. financing, local fairs, and the opening of new markets. These conclusions and recommendations are supported by the content of the paper.</i>		
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>		
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.		
<i>The Reference section contains numerous well-selected recent sources published mainly after 2020-ies.</i>		

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

In view of the quality of the paper reviewed, I recommend to publish this research paper in the European Scientific Journal.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

In view of the quality of the paper reviewed, I recommend to publish this research paper in the European Scientific Journal.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: Róbert Sándor Szűcs Dr.	
University/Country: University of Debrecen, Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 10.06.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 15.06.2025
Manuscript Title: Family entrepreneurship in the local economic structure: A study in Ecuador	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 51.05.2025	
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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title, "Family entrepreneurship in the local economic structure: A study in Ecuador", is clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content and focus of the article. It specifies both the subject (family entrepreneurship) and the context (local economic structure in Ecuador), which aligns well with the study's scope and findings</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>The abstract succinctly presents the research objective, outlines the methods (qualitative and quantitative approaches, use of regression analyses), and summarizes the main results regarding the impact of family entrepreneurship on the economic structure of Guano Canton. All key components - objectives, methods, and results - are present and well-articulated.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4

<i>The article is generally well-written, with only a few minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that do not impede understanding. The overall language quality is above average for scientific writing, and errors are infrequent and not severe.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methods section is clearly explained, detailing the research design (descriptive correlational), sample selection (72 family businesses), data collection instruments (questionnaire), and analytical techniques (multinomial logistic regression, multiple linear regression). The rationale for methodological choices is also provided, supporting the study's validity.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are presented clearly, with relevant statistics, model fit information, and interpretations. Statistical findings are explained in context, and tables are referenced appropriately. There are no apparent errors or inconsistencies in the results section.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions accurately reflect the study's findings and are well-supported by the data and analyses presented. The summary discusses both challenges and opportunities, providing recommendations that logically follow from the results.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The reference list is comprehensive, current, and relevant, covering both foundational and recent works in the field. The sources cited are appropriate for the topic and demonstrate a thorough engagement with the literature.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: