

Review of: "Determinants of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) Sustainable Development in Africa"

Yuen Onn Choong¹

¹ Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for allowing me to review the paper entitled "Determinants of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) Sustainable Development in Africa" Here are some suggestions to improve the paper:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?

1. At first, the introduction is well not written. Although the issue is written clearly with sufficient elaborations. The linkage between issue and key concepts are weak. This is difficult to relate the issue with the key concepts.
2. Next, Please make a stronger case as to why your paper is needed and how you contribute to current academic discussion. You should be more convincing and using the current literature review to indicate the gap that needs to be closed. You have to explain why the gap matters. Why is the gap a real concern? What will go wrong if the gap is unaddressed? The authors need to explain better what is the main puzzle their research is addressing.
3. I would like to suggest author to revise the introduction which can consider following flow of the introduction and addressing the following questions: (1) Briefly describe and illustrate the current issue. (2) Why is such a study with proposed research gaps important? (3) How does this research gap relate to the current issue? (4) Why is such an underexplored piece of work important to be tested in your study? (5) Are there any similar studies conducted in the past? (6) What is the uniqueness of this study compared to past empirical studies? (7) What are the research objectives? (8) What are the contributions of the study?
4. Research objective can be combined with introduction section.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?

1. To enhance the clarity and coherence of the research, I recommend the authors thoroughly explain how any theory support and provide a robust theoretical framework for the current study. By elaborating on the theory's key concepts and demonstrating its relevance to the research topic, the authors can establish a stronger connection between the theoretical foundation and the study's objectives. Additionally, by illustrating how the theory informs the research design and the interpretation of results, the authors can enhance the overall credibility of their study.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?

1. The current version of research method is not sufficiently written and not clear. Should have two sub-sections: (1) research procedure and samples and (2) research instrument.
 2. The authors should discuss the generalizability and representativeness of their sample in relation to the target population. Authors need to clearly explain how the chosen sample is intended to be representative of and reflective of the larger population. Any strategies employed to ensure a diverse and inclusive sample should also be highlighted. This will increase the credibility of the research findings and help readers understand the extent to which the results can be generalized to the broader population.
 3. It is essential to provide a clear explanation of the sampling technique used in the study, along with the rationale for its selection. The authors should describe how they utilized this sampling technique to select respondents for the survey, ensuring generalizability and representativeness towards the targeted population. By doing so, readers can better understand the methodological approach and the potential limitations associated with the sample selection.
 4. The procedure of data collection needs to be elaborated further. The authors should explain in more detail how they collected the data, how they approached the respondents, and how they identified participants for the survey study. This explanation should be reasonable and logical, avoiding exaggerations and providing a clear account of the steps taken in the data collection process.
 5. The authors should provide adequate justification for the use of the software in this study. They should explain why this particular software was chosen and how it aligns with the research objectives. By elaborating on the software's specific functionalities and how it supports the analysis of the data, the authors can enhance the validity and reliability of their findings.
 6. More details regard to research instruments should be reported. Please refer to quality article on how to report the measurement instrument.
 7. Any pretest and pilot test conducted? Why not?
 8. Why was regression techniques used to analyse the model and hypotheses? Should use structural equations modelling technique.
4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?
1. Why is regression used? Why not structural equation modelling?
 2. Common method bias should be conducted.
 3. Should report the characteristics of the sample.
5. Practicality and/or Research implications: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for practice and/or further research? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the
1. I would suggest author to structure their conclusion part of the manuscript as follows: (1) Discussion, (2) Implications, (3) Limitations and Future Research Recommendations, and (4) Conclusion.
 2. For theoretical implications. How can you imply from the findings? This section should discuss the implications of the

study's findings and how they contribute to the existing theoretical knowledge. Summarize the key findings and their relevance to the existing theoretical frameworks or models. Analyze how the findings align with or challenge current theoretical perspectives and concepts related to all the key concepts of this study. Discuss any theoretical insights or advancements that the study provides and highlight how the findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the research area.

3. Should have a standalone section for practical implications: the authors should provide valuable insights based on current practices and policies, supported by evidence from their research. To strengthen the practical implications, it is crucial to reference specific findings, data, or examples that demonstrate the validity and reliability of the recommendations. By incorporating this approach, the authors can offer concrete and actionable suggestions that have a solid grounding in their research findings.
4. The limitation and future research recommendation section is required to be improved.