

Review of: "The Role of Women's Business Performance in Promoting Sustainable Development"

Alina Zaharia¹

¹ Academia de Studii Economice din Bucuresti

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear authors,

Thank you for giving me the chance to review your article. In my opinion, the article is interesting in the context of both sustainable development and gender gap issues. So, here are my suggestions:

1. In my opinion the title should be somewhat changed, as, when reading the title, my thought was that I would see an analysis of how women's business performance would impact/promote sustainable development (SD) through a SD proxy. For example: Drivers of women's business performance in Ethiopia
2. Keywords: In my opinion, you should eliminate "Women Business Performance", and add other three relevant keywords. This is because the title already has this concept.
3. Introduction: In my view, you should add more references to the 3 points of view from the first paragraph from Introduction, as well as the following points of view throughout all Introduction, because it would strengthen and validate your arguments. Also, it would be interesting to add why is important and how this research could contribute to the international scientific scene first, and then to add the explanations for local level. Additionally, it would be helpful for the readers to know some socio-demographic and economic aspects of Karat Town in comparison with national level (for example some percentages: % of total population, density of population, % of total surface, % of total gdp, etc.), as they would be able to get an overall picture of the analysed place and, maybe, they could even compare it with their own town. In my opinion, the subsections 1.1 and 1.2 should be added to methodological section, and in Introduction section, you should add only a phrase of the main purpose of the study with the used method.
4. Literature review: 2.3 Conceptual framework - the relationship of the independent variables are on unidirectional towards women's business performance in literature or not? As it is now, I do not understand its significance to the paper, as you already present the models in Methods.
5. Methods: I think you should eliminate 3.1, 3.2, 3.5 and 3.6 as separate subsections, and leave only your input: For example: from 3.1 "The researchers adopted an explanatory research design where the effect caused by the independent variables on the dependent variable is observed through regression analysis." From 3.2, "The researchers employed a quantitative research approach due to the quantitative nature of the questionnaire". Also, you should add specifically, what is the data sources, how you collected data, when, what are the primary data sources, and what are these sources from your statement: "Multiple data sources are often utilized to triangulate findings and increase the overall robustness of the study". In 3.4, for sample size, if p stands for probability, it should be 5% or

$p=0.05$, and you should add what the population proportion you chose (for example, here you should take into consideration % of Ethiopian business women at national level). From my point of view, please revise the sample size calculation. You also should add, why did you chose this method and add references to the explanation of methodological approach and to validate what you have chosen (subsection 3.5 & 3.6). So you should specify your collection tools, how did you applied it, when, who, through which channel? In 3.7 you should add the meaning of beta.

6. You should add the questionnaire as appendix and state it in methods section, while describing the variables.
7. Results: In my view, you should correlate the results with past literature review in both 4.5 and 4.6 sections. Usually, the correlation matrix also tell us which variables could be added in one regression, because we should not add variables with high correlation between them (the coefficient should be less than 0.4/0.5 - you should check more literature on this topic). You could also do causality testings. The results should be more thoroughly explain in correlation with past research.
8. Please recheck the English for typos.
9. Finally, I agree with all comments made by Rizka Zulfikar and I did not checked for plagiarism.

This was an interesting research, but it needs some improvements. Best wishes, Alina