

# Review of: "Impact of entrepreneurial orientation on business performance: Analysis of small-medium sized corn enterprises"

Odafe Egere<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Leicester

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is an interesting article. However, I have some concern for the authors to improve the work as follows: I suggest the authors should structure the manuscript properly for example: introduction (provide better introduction with clear aspiration of your study including rational and gaps why you are doing the study), literature review (review extant literature on entrepreneurship orientation, which can inform the discussion section vis-à-vis your results and findings), Theoretical Review (this section can form part of LR section. see specific comments below and also at the end of this section conceptualise a clearer theoretical model to support your study), methodology (see comments on this section below), Results and findings (clear analysis of your results and findings), discussion (see comments on this section below), conclusion (see comments on this section below). Lastly, rework the manuscript to acceptable standard including a proper editing to improve overall readability.

## Title

The title is misleading because findings cannot be generalized to all nations. I suggest to put the name of the country Indonesia in the title. example: Impact of entrepreneurial orientation on business performance: Analysis of small-medium sized corn enterprises in Indonesia

## Abstract

Abstract should be completely written in past tense and highlight the key elements of the study. Please review the abstract and also improve the readability.

## Introduction

Your introductory section needs some improvements to bring it to standard. It does not sufficiently set the hook for this study. It is very difficult to understand why you embarked on this study. i.e., The rationale for the study and the research questions you intend to address is not clear. You also introduced several concepts which I find very difficult to piece together. Follow proper referencing style, use et al when the authors are more than two. "He also believes" who is the he? Poor writing style, need to edit the paragraphs improve the language and readability. "Only the farm industry experienced positive growth of 2.15% compared to the previous year" so what was the figure for the previous year under comparison.

Using “According to” at this level is not proper. Critically discuss authors ideas and close the sentence with the source reference in a closed bracket. Paragraphs should be a minimum of 5 sentences. It is also good practice that you conclude your introductory section with a paragraph that explains how your manuscript is structured. At the moment, this is missing. These missing pieces within your introductory section will put off readers from your manuscript as this section will help them decide whether to read your paper or not.

### Theoretical Review

The theoretical review section need improvement. It does not sufficiently provide depth to deepen the reader understandings vis-a-vis Indonesia. It is very difficult to understand how these listed theories link into the Indonesian situation. Your reviews should not just be about defining these theories. I find it very difficult to piece together these theories in the context of Indonesia because you only succeeded in listing and defining them. You did not review the theories with the criticality expected at this level. Do not use according to or an author state so or so. Provide a critical review of the authors idea and add the reference at the end of such sentences in a closed bracket. Follow proper referencing style, use et al when the authors are more than two. Do this across your manuscript. You will need to update the literature with some recent publications post 2019 to add more value.

### Methodology

The methodology section need improvement. It does not sufficiently provide understanding because there are several missing pieces to help the reader know your procedure. This section requires additional input. How did you arrive at the sample of 47. What is the proportion of the 47 respondents to the total number of SMES in Indonesia? What is the spread of these SMES? Are they from a single state in Indonesia or across all the regions in Indonesia? It is not clear the features of the SMEs that you included. What are the characteristics of the business owners? Are there other useful information that could give us insights into the features of the data you used. In order words, you did not offer any descriptive statistics of the respondents. The methods section is weak. Develop it further to help the reader understanding. Do not use according to or an author state so or so. Provide a critical review of the authors idea and add the reference at the end of such sentences in a closed bracket.

### Results and Discussion

Separate the results section from the discussion. Have a separate discussion section and provide proper analysis of your findings in relation to the literature and theoretical review section. The discussion section should also detail the contributions of this study to literature and knowledge, which is not clear and missing. Your discussion should evaluate your findings in the light of prior studies.

### Conclusion

The conclusion section need improvement. What you presently have as conclusion should form part of your discussion section. Conclusion should not be reference because it is a reflective summary of your study and also offer some essential recommendations. It should also include important discussions around your study implication for policy and

practice in Indonesia, and recommendation of areas for further research.