

Tasks

ascaryan

113 / Suroso et al. / THE EVALUATION OF ENTREPRENEUR INCUBATION PROGRAM AT HIGHER EDUCATION

Library

WorkflowPublication

- [Submission](#)

- [Review](#)

- [Copyediting](#)

- [Production](#)

- [Round 1](#)

Round 1 StatusSubmission accepted.

Notifications

- [\[IJEK\] Editor Decision](#)2020-12-07 09:54 AM
- [\[IJEK\] Editor Decision](#)2020-12-07 11:00 AM
- [\[IJEK\] Editor Decision](#)2020-12-14 10:38 AM

Reviewer's Attachments

- [Search](#)

Name	Date	Component
------	------	-----------

No Files

Revisions

- [Search](#)

- [Upload File](#)

Name	Date	Component
------	------	-----------

Settings 237 113 Revision mark red Suroso Agus.docx		
---	--	--

December 14,
2020

Compon

Article T

Review Discussions

- [Add discussion](#)

Name	From	Last Reply	Replies
------	------	------------	---------

No Items

Clos

Notifications

×undefined

[IJEK] Editor Decision

2020-12-07 11:00 AM

Dear Ascaryan Rafinda, Agus Suroso, Timea Gal:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge, "THE EVALUATION OF ENTREPRENEUR INCUBATION PROGRAM AT HIGHER EDUCATION".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Please focus on the comments of the reviewers and try to follow all their recommendations.

Please verify if the abstract has the following structure (without naming the subchapters of the abstract):

- Objectives
- Data & Methods
- Results
- Implications & Recommendations
- Contribution & Added Value

I also recommend adding some literary sources from the following journals:

- <https://www.cjournal.cz/>
- <http://www.ijek.org/>
- <https://www.economics-sociology.eu/>
- <https://www.jois.eu/>
- <http://oeconomia.pl/>
- <https://pjms.zim.pcz.pl/>

We expect you to send us 2 documents:

1. The final version prepared according to the authors' template and including information about the authors and their brief description.
2. Version with the corrections marked with red color.

We believe that the paper has a good chance to be published in the next issue in the case that all our recommendations will be acknowledged. Please send the updated version within 2 weeks.

Please find the reviews below.

Sincerely,

doc. Ing. Aleksandr Ključnikov, Ph.D.
University of Entrepreneurship and Law, Prague
aleksandr.kljucnikov@vspp.cz

doc. Ing. Aleksandr Ključnikov Ph.D.
Editor

International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge

Michálkovická 1810/181
710 00 Ostrava-Slezská Ostrava
Czech Republic

Web: www.ijek.org
Email: info@ijek.org

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The quality of the manuscript (i.e. novelty, complexity, scientific level).

Good quality.

Scientific novelty and originality of the approach.

Reviewer comments:

The theoretical part contains only 15 scientific sources. Is needed to insert more relevant sources (min. 5 sources from Scopus or WOS).

Methodology

Reviewer comments:

Methodology:

- Authors used the multiple regression method. Please exact to explain the dependent variable and independent variables.
- Used authors linear regression (or different type of regression function)?
- Please better explain partnerships between Hungary university and Indonesian university.

Data:

- Please insert one paragraph about the questionnaire (e.g. number of questions, link on the questionnaire, the return rate, type of questions and type answers, and so on).
- When were the questionnaire collected (time period)?
- The questionnaire was formulated in the national language of the student (or only English version)?
- How were the criteria on the students (all students of university or e.g. ending students of university)?

Methods:

- The assumption of the autocorrelation is needed to be verified if the data are time series. The reviewer thinks that the authors not used time-series data.

Clarity of presentation of results.

Reviewer comments:

- Why first table is Table no. 2? Technical quality of this table is not good.

- The authors said: “ The autocorrelation test in this research uses the Durbin Watson test. Two independent variables and the number of samples 355. Based on the Watson durbin table with $\alpha = 0.05$ and the number of samples 355 found the values of dL and dU as follows 1,748 and 1,789. The results of the SSSS found that the value of the research durbin watson was 2.040. The value of 2,040 is higher than the value of du and below the value of 4-du (4 - 1.789), which is 2.211. The conclusion from this is that no symptoms of autocorrelation were found.”. This paragraph is not good. Please delete this section.
- Please delete numbers: 45. And 46. (only technical errors).
- Decimal points are not good technical quality – it is not English style – see all tables (table 3, 4, 5, ..., 12) and delete errors (decimal point not - .000 - good version; ,000 - bad version).

Results and conclusion

Reviewer comments:

Conclusion:

Please insert one section about the limitations of case study (data sample, methods, countries and so on).

Practical implications, implications for research and/or society

Good quality.

Originality

3 = good

Contribution to the Field

3 = good

Technical Quality

3 = good

Clarity of Presentation

3 = good

Depth of Research

3 = good

Final decision of the reviewer.

Requires Moderate Revision

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

The quality of the manuscript (i.e. novelty, complexity, scientific level).

The scientific quality of the article is not at a high level. There are a lot of grammatical, syntactic and semantic errors in the English language. The purpose of the article could be more precisely defined. The results obtained by the authors should be compared with the results in already existing literary sources. Also, in general, the review of literature sources can be more extensive. There is an incomprehensible numbering in the text of the article, and the structure does not correspond to the rules of the journal.

Scientific novelty and originality of the approach.

The topic chosen by the authors is interesting, as it is of great practical importance. However, the goals and objectives of the article are vaguely defined; they can be defined more precisely. It is also clearer to define them already in the abstract of the article so that later it would be easier for other authors to navigate when reading this manuscript.

Methodology

I suppose the authors wanted to do a good research job. As for the methodology used, it would be possible to present it in a more structured way and determine why these research methods were chosen for this article.

Clarity of presentation of results.

The data is presented in a very incomprehensible and confusing way. Table 1 is missing. Table 2 data is not structured. There is no source description under each of the table. There are large indents between paragraphs. The word "table" is misspelt ("tabel"). You can more clearly highlight the results of the hypotheses put forward.

Results and conclusion

As I noted above, it is good practice to compare the results obtained with the results in the existing literature with similar studies. There is no personal opinion of the authors as to why the obtained data are so in their opinion. The limitations of the article are not indicated, and in general, this part should be worked out: summarize the hypotheses, determine whether the goals and objectives of the article have been achieved.

Practical implications, implications for research and/or society

At the end of the article, the authors note the possible practical use of their work. The topic is quite interesting, and with proper refinement, it could be very practically useful, especially considering that it compares two very culturally different countries.

Originality

2 = very good

Contribution to the Field

3 = good

Technical Quality

4 = unsatisfactory

Clarity of Presentation

4 = unsatisfactory

Depth of Research

3 = good

Final decision of the reviewer.

Requires Major Revision

Editorial Office

International journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge

Czech Republic

ISSN 2336-2960 (Online)

Web: www.ijek.org

Email: info@ijek.org