

Review of: "Sustainable entrepreneurial ecosystems in developing economies: A conceptualisation of complex adaptive systems approach"

Abdulkadir Abdulrashid Rafindadi¹

¹ Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor,

I have gone through the article titled: Sustainable Entrepreneurial Ecosystems in Developing Economies: A Conceptualisation of the Complex Adaptive Systems Approach. I have the following observations that will help in adding value to the submitted manuscript for the author.

1. In the abstract, the author needs to introduce the problems of the study and then be followed by the theoretical or empirical methodology that the study adopts or will adopt and why? This should be followed by a few disaggregated findings from the study. In the findings provided, the author needs to provide the impacts and implications of the findings discovered by the study and what causes that. The author then needs to identify the implications of that for existing or future policy issues/overall case study area.
2. The introduction of the study contains a very short glimpse of the subject matter, "Entrepreneurial Ecosystem." In this virgin area of study, the author should attempt to identify loopholes from the behavioural and empirical implications commonly identifiable in modern entrepreneurial practices. In addition to that, in the introduction, the author needs to identify what usually happens and what the causative factors are leading to benign and malignant entrepreneurial ecosystems, and how modern entrepreneurial practices and their environment can get infested with the latter factor, and what traceable factors heralded mistakes or shortcomings in a typical economic system where such models thrive. Typically, authors should clearly delineate to readers the conditions of a malignant entrepreneurial ecosystem and what their respective traceable features are. In addition to that, case study area(s) **MUST** be used in order to show how to attain an efficient and effective or optimal economic structure for the sound attainment of freely infested entrepreneurial ecosystems. In the direction of this argument, the study then needs to proceed on what was done before but it failed and now what the new model or methodology can offer. **For instance, the authors need to configure carefully the structural composition of what and how the arrangements of the continuum or classes of those ecosystems distort**, pique, or pose better economic growth resilience for harvesting excellent entrepreneurial practices devoid of malignancy. In the same vein, how the phenomenon under observation (the

metaphorical entrepreneurial ecosystem) can be reconciled while using the selected variables or the new method in focus will help to close the dichotomy in the study.

3. In the literature review, please eliminate all subheadings and appreciate the use of sentence linkers to link the ideas you are aiming to put forward. It is only in report writing that subheadings need to be introduced, but not in academic journal writing style. In addition to that, you need to condense the review to include only topical issues that will expose the gap(s) in the study.
 - I. Itemize the objectives of the study and ensure good linkage with the literature reviewed and the empirical model of the study.
5. Please provide the limitations of the study, if any, and convince readers and reviewers why the study is limited in that aspect. From the ensuing evidence, I was left with the belief that the study is aiming to use a theoretical research model. This development suggests that the study cannot be generalized to the holistic components of entrepreneurial practices. If this should be the case, then the title of the study should suggest that. This is on the basis of the fact that the study cannot be generalized to all cases of entrepreneurial practices as a whole.
 - I. The study should provide adequate comparison and discussions of results. This is very necessary in order to expose the novelty of the current findings in the study. The study has failed to provide an objective comparison of results on why and how things exist or went the way they were discovered from the trail of comparative analysis that is very necessary to be made (particularly on major variables of the study), how realistically positive or otherwise the model applied in the study impacted negatively or positively on the case study area(s). The comparison of results should also expose the superiority of the current findings over past studies or otherwise, and where possible, the study should try to provide a glimpse of key happenings in the individual case studies as disaggregated from the results, etc.
 - II. The authors should identify the strengths or weaknesses of their findings for policy makers, bearing in mind the comparison of results provided. The authors should also provide within the framework of the comparison made a plan on how to mitigate the identified level of weakness, etc.
 - III. The conclusion of a study should portray some philosophical bearings from what was obtained or discovered in the empirical findings of the study, i.e., it should not be a restatement of already mentioned facts, but it should be an exposure of some hidden facts from the study with an overall philosophical thought on how the study logically uncovered a key area of knowledge that was earlier not given attention or is a meretricious fact. From this development, the author(s) should establish the implications of that and what the advantages of that are to the case study areas under investigation. This should be provided in a philosophically convincing argument. In addition to that, the authors should assess the position of their new findings in relation to the end purpose of the research objective, research problem, and other past studies and verify accordingly, whether this development is attributable to the method, data, samples, or techniques used. This should be presented in a professional, logical, and convincing way to convey some key scientific thoughts to the readers. The present conclusion provided in the manuscript should be improved to have a reflection of scientific realities and the novelty of the research findings of the study.

