PEER REVIEW REPORT OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Open access   OPEN SUPPLEMENTS

Manuscript data:

Type of manuscript	: Technological article
Title	: Educational support to improve female entrepreneurship: A case study amidst social inequalities
Authors	: Graziela Perretto Rodrigues (iD) ✉, and Cleia Denise Santos Ciscato (iD) ✉
Manuscript's DOI	: https://doi.org/10.14211/regepe.esbj.e2519.

Article ID: e2519

Peer review report data:

Round ↓	Reviewers			
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
1	R1R1	R1R2		
2				
3				
4				

Editorial data:

Editor-in-Chef[1] or Adjunct[2]: (iD)
[1] Dr. Edmundo Inácio Júnior
Univ. Estadual de Campinas, UNICAMP

Associate Editor: (iD)
Dr. Julio Carneiro Cunha
Universidade Nove de Julho, UNINOVE

Executive[1] or Assistant[2] Editor:
[1]M. Eng. Patrícia Trindade de Araújo

ROUND 1:

1st Reviewer: Anonymous

Completed   : 2024-08-08 03:25 PM
Recommendation : Revisions Required

1. Theme

Does the introductory text explain the theme in which the article is inserted? Is the theme related to entrepreneurship?

Strongly Disagree: The theme is unclear or not relevant to the field of study.

Disagree: The theme is underexplored or not innovative within the field.

Neutral: The theme is clear but could be more detailed or original.

■ Agree: The theme is relevant and well defined for the field of study.

Strongly Agree: The theme is highly relevant, innovative, and well defined for the field of study.

2. Problem or Opportunity

Is the problem or opportunity clearly identified? Is the context presented current and relevant? Are facts and supporting data presented for the arguments raised?

Strongly Disagree: The problem or opportunity is unclear or not relevant to the field of study.

Disagree: The problem or opportunity is underexplored or not significant within the field.

Neutral: The problem or opportunity is clear but could be more detailed or relevant.

■ Agree: The problem or opportunity is relevant and well defined for the field of study.

Strongly Agree: The problem or opportunity is highly relevant, innovative, and well defined for the field of study.

3. Objective(s)

Is the objective(s) clearly identified? Is there a clear and relevant practical contribution?

Strongly Disagree: The objective(s) are unclear or inadequate for the article.

Disagree: The objective(s) are not specific enough or not fully aligned with the theme.

Neutral: The objective(s) are clear but could be more detailed or precise.

■ Agree: The objective(s) are specific and well aligned with the theme of the article.

Strongly Agree: The objective(s) are exceptionally clear, precise, and directly related to the theme of the article.

4. Writing the Technological Article

Is the entire text written in clear, non-technical language, accessible to a wide audience? Has unnecessary jargon and technical terminology been used?.

Strongly Disagree: The writing is confusing, poorly structured, or hinders understanding of the article.

Disagree: The writing is unclear or does not maintain reader interest.

■ Neutral: The writing is adequate but could be more engaging or precise.

Agree: The writing is clear and maintains reader interest throughout the article.

Strongly Agree: The writing is exceptionally clear, engaging, and facilitates understanding of the article.

5. Scientific Rationale

Does the text present a scientific dialogue (even if brief) with the main authors related to its theme? Is there a minimum scientific basis? Is it demonstrated what is already known and/or explained the main concepts necessary for the proposal of the article?

Strongly The scientific foundation is inadequate or missing.

Disagree: The scientific foundation is weak or not well-supported by relevant references.

Neutral: The scientific foundation is adequate but could be more robust.

■ Agree: The scientific foundation is solid and well-supported by relevant references.

Strongly Agree: The scientific foundation is exceptionally robust, comprehensive, and well-supported by relevant references.

6. Methodological Procedures

Are the procedures carried out for data collection and analysis presented in a way that is necessary to prove scientific rigor (even if succinctly)? Is there use of visual schemes that demonstrate the research step-by-step?

Strongly Disagree: The methodological procedures are inadequate or poorly described.

Disagree: The methodological procedures are vague or not appropriate for the study.

■ Neutral: The methodological procedures are adequate but could be more detailed or precise.

Agree: The methodological procedures are clear and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: The methodological procedures are exceptionally clear, detailed, and appropriate for the study.

7. Presentation of the Solution

Is the proposed solution properly described? Is the solution consistent with the identified problem/opportunity? Does the proposal go beyond description and offer prescriptive advice? Are the proposed advice duly substantiated?

Strongly Disagree: The solution presented is inadequate or poorly described.

Disagree: The solution presented is vague or does not address all aspects of the problem.

Neutral: The solution presented is adequate but could be more detailed or effective.

■ Agree: The solution presented is clear and addresses all aspects of the problem.

Strongly Agree: The solution presented is exceptionally clear, detailed, and effective in addressing the problem.

8. Practical Contribution

Is there demonstration of relevant practical contribution? Is the contribution specific to an analyzed unit or generalizable? Are the research limitations and suggestions for future studies presented?

Strongly Disagree: The practical contribution is nonexistent or irrelevant.

Disagree: The practical contribution is limited or not significant.

Neutral: The practical contribution is adequate but could be more impactful or relevant.

■ Agree: The practical contribution is significant and relevant to the field.

Strongly Agree: The practical contribution is exceptionally relevant and offers significant impact in the field.

9. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/ subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of the use of the Business Model Canvas in entrepreneurship, with a focus on female microenterprises. Although the introduction and literature review establish a solid theoretical foundation, they are somewhat outdated. The research question would benefit from greater clarity. The qualitative case study methodology is well-chosen but could be improved by including detailed criteria for case selection and data analysis processes. Additionally, it is necessary to clarify which course was involved in the study, the specific discipline, how many students benefited, and how the approach to the stylist was made. Why was this particular stylist chosen?

The results are clearly connected to the theoretical framework, demonstrating the positive impact of educational support and tools like the Business Model Canvas on female entrepreneurship in contexts of social inequality. Including more specific examples could strengthen the practical implications. The methodology section would benefit from additional details on how the university engaged the entrepreneur, specifying the course and number of participants, and justifying the choice of the entrepreneur based on clear criteria. Furthermore, explaining why the chosen discipline was appropriate for the study would illustrate how the application of the Canvas aligned with the academic and practical objectives of the course. Overall, it is recommended to review the grammatical and stylistic elements to improve the manuscript's flow and to rewrite the methodology with more detail and clarity.

©ANEGEPE, São Paulo - SP.

REGEPE Entrep. Small Bus. J., v.14, Jan./Dec., 2025

10. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

◼ Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Approved.

11. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

◼ Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.

©ANEGEPE, São Paulo - SP.

REGEPE Entrep. Small Bus. J., v.14, Jan./Dec., 2025

2ⁿᵈ Reviewer: Melissa Ribeiro do Amaral

Completed   : 2024-10-09 05:07 PM
Recommendation : Accept Submission

1. Theme

Does the introductory text explain the theme in which the article is inserted? Is the theme related to entrepreneurship?

- ■ Strongly Disagree: The theme is unclear or not relevant to the field of study.

  Disagree: The theme is underexplored or not innovative within the field.

  Neutral: The theme is clear but could be more detailed or original.

  Agree: The theme is relevant and well defined for the field of study.

  Strongly Agree: The theme is highly relevant, innovative, and well defined for the field of study.

2. Problem or Opportunity

Is the problem or opportunity clearly identified? Is the context presented current and relevant? Are facts and supporting data presented for the arguments raised?

  Strongly Disagree: The problem or opportunity is unclear or not relevant to the field of study.

  Disagree: The problem or opportunity is underexplored or not significant within the field.

  Neutral: The problem or opportunity is clear but could be more detailed or relevant.

- ■ Agree: The problem or opportunity is relevant and well defined for the field of study.

  Strongly Agree: The problem or opportunity is highly relevant, innovative, and well defined for the field of study.

3. Objective(s)

Is the objective(s) clearly identified? Is there a clear and relevant practical contribution?

  Strongly Disagree: The objective(s) are unclear or inadequate for the article.

  Disagree: The objective(s) are not specific enough or not fully aligned with the theme.

  Neutral: The objective(s) are clear but could be more detailed or precise.

- ■ Agree: The objective(s) are specific and well aligned with the theme of the article.

  Strongly Agree: The objective(s) are exceptionally clear, precise, and directly related to the theme of the article.

4. Writing the Technological Article

Is the entire text written in clear, non-technical language, accessible to a wide audience? Has unnecessary jargon and technical terminology been used?.

  Strongly Disagree: The writing is confusing, poorly structured, or hinders understanding of the article.

  Disagree: The writing is unclear or does not maintain reader interest.

- ■ Neutral: The writing is adequate but could be more engaging or precise.

  Agree: The writing is clear and maintains reader interest throughout the article.

  Strongly Agree: The writing is exceptionally clear, engaging, and facilitates understanding of the article.

5. Scientific Rationale

Does the text present a scientific dialogue (even if brief) with the main authors related to its theme? Is there a minimum scientific basis? Is it demonstrated what is already known and/or explained the main concepts necessary for the proposal of the article?

  Strongly The scientific foundation is inadequate or missing.

  Disagree: The scientific foundation is weak or not well-supported by relevant references.

  Neutral: The scientific foundation is adequate but could be more robust.

- ■ Agree: The scientific foundation is solid and well-supported by relevant references.

  Strongly Agree: The scientific foundation is exceptionally robust, comprehensive, and well-supported by relevant references.

©ANEGEPE, São Paulo - SP.

REGEPE Entrep. Small Bus. J., v.14, Jan./Dec., 2025

6. Methodological Procedures

Are the procedures carried out for data collection and analysis presented in a way that is necessary to prove scientific rigor (even if succinctly)? Is there use of visual schemes that demonstrate the research step-by-step?

Strongly Disagree: The methodological procedures are inadequate or poorly described.

Disagree: The methodological procedures are vague or not appropriate for the study.

Neutral: The methodological procedures are adequate but could be more detailed or precise.

■ Agree: The methodological procedures are clear and appropriate for the study.

Strongly Agree: The methodological procedures are exceptionally clear, detailed, and appropriate for the study.

7. Presentation of the Solution

Is the proposed solution properly described? Is the solution consistent with the identified problem/opportunity? Does the proposal go beyond description and offer prescriptive advice? Are the proposed advice duly substantiated?

Strongly Disagree: The solution presented is inadequate or poorly described.

Disagree: The solution presented is vague or does not address all aspects of the problem.

Neutral: The solution presented is adequate but could be more detailed or effective.

■ Agree: The solution presented is clear and addresses all aspects of the problem.

Strongly Agree: The solution presented is exceptionally clear, detailed, and effective in addressing the problem.

8. Practical Contribution

Is there demonstration of relevant practical contribution? Is the contribution specific to an analyzed unit or generalizable? Are the research limitations and suggestions for future studies presented?

Strongly Disagree: The practical contribution is nonexistent or irrelevant.

Disagree: The practical contribution is limited or not significant.

Neutral: The practical contribution is adequate but could be more impactful or relevant.

■ Agree: The practical contribution is significant and relevant to the field.

Strongly Agree: The practical contribution is exceptionally relevant and offers significant impact in the field.

9. General Evaluation

Please provide a qualitative assessment of the manuscript in the space below. It is recommended that comments be provided on each of the items evaluated above, and that they be as clear and specific as possible. This space is also intended for general comments that could lead to an improvement in the manuscript. Such comments may pertain to the structure of the manuscript (division of sections/subsections), the manner in which the results are presented (graphs, tables, etc.), or other useful comments for the authors.

The topic relates to entrepreneurship. The article introduces the theme of female entrepreneurship coherently and well-explained. The problem is relevant and timely, and the authors reference existing literature to support their arguments. I found it difficult to understand the objectives of the article; they could be better formulated. The text is written clearly and objectively, which facilitates reader comprehension.

The methodology is concise but well-written. The authors present a well-structured solution in which female micro-entrepreneurship, supported by strategic planning and the practical application of a business plan through the Canvas methodology, led to significant improvements and has the potential to mitigate inequalities and be successful.

The study brings relevant contributions to the topic, but it faced many limitations due to the lack of data for statistical generalization. Another limitation is the cross-sectional nature of the research, which did not follow the application over time. The study offers various suggestions for future research.

10. Reviewer Conclusion (Recommendation):

Submit new versions for appreciation based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

Reject based on the suggestions/recommendations indicated.

■ Approved.

11. In compliance with Open Science, we ask if you (reviewer) agree with the publication of the manuscript evaluation reports, according to the following options:

■ Yes, I agree to open the review WITH my identification.

Yes, I agree to open the review WITHOUT my identification.

I do NOT agree to open the review.