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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This paper looks at how digital outsourcing can impact the success of youth-led businesses in Sub-Saharan Africa. Youth unemployment is still a major challenge and many young people are turning to entrepreneurship. This research provides helpful insights that can guide both policymakers and young entrepreneurs. What makes this study stand out is that it offers real and practical suggestions. For young entrepreneurs already using digital outsourcing, this paper encourages them to pay closer attention to how it supports their growth. For those who are not yet familiar with it, this knowledge, and findings can help them to explore and make use of this approach. | We sincerely thank the reviewer for highlighting the relevance of this study to youth entrepreneurship in Sub-Saharan Africa. By examining the demand-side of digital outsourcing, the paper provides actionable guidance for policymakers and young entrepreneurs, encouraging both informed adoption and strategic use of outsourcing to support business growth. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes, the title is suitable. It is clear and reflects the content of the paper. I do not suggest an alternative. | We are grateful for the positive assessment and will retain the current title as it clearly reflects the paper’s content and focus |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is comprehensive. The abstract gives a brief overview of the background of the study, objectives, data and methods used, results and contributions. When you read it you get to know all the key things that were done. It states the demand-side focus and the countries involved in the study and other key things like it used OLS regression and other methods. You might consider rewording the line that starts with "yet comparative..." to make it sound less technical for the wider audience. | We appreciate the constructive feedback and have reworded the line beginning with “yet comparative…” to improve accessibility for a wider audience. We have also confirmed that the abstract remains comprehensive and clearly communicates the study’s scope, methods, and findings. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | It is scientifically correct. The author used secondary data that is World Bank Enterprise Surveys (WBES) for the firm level analysis and Global Entrepreneur Monitor (GEM) for the firm level analysis. The author shows us in steps how the various samples were obtained accounting for transparency in the dataset usage. A common accepted rule of thumb is to have at least 10 to 15 observations per predictor variable to ensure reliable estimates and avoid overfitting. Given the study's sample sizes of 700 observations from the firm-level WBES dataset and 950 observations from the individual-level GEM dataset, the author is well above this threshold. Therefore, the sample is sufficiently large to support multivariate regression analysis. It uses quantitative methods (OLS, logistic regression, PSM, IV-2SLS) and the findings are supported with the appropriate statistical evidence as well. | We thank the reviewer for affirming the study’s methodological rigor, dataset transparency, and adequacy of sample size. All analyses have been re-verified to ensure accuracy and clarity. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. They include important earlier works and recent reports from 2023 to 2025. | We appreciate the positive feedback on reference sufficiency and recency. As suggested, we have added Nyoni, Bvuma, and Marnewick (2025) to strengthen the literature base on digital outsourcing adoption. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The writing is clear and it is suitable for scholarly communication. I noticed a few things that could be improved to make the paper easier to read. The use of "it's" should be avoided in formal academic writing. It is better to use the full form, such as "it is," because contractions are generally considered informal. Certain technical terms like "mediated-moderation test" may be difficult for non-academic readers to understand. You can consider briefly explaining such terms in a footnote since the paper is intended for a large audience. | We are thankful for the observations on writing style. We have replaced contractions (e.g., “it’s” to “it is”) and added a brief explanatory footnote for technical terms like “mediated-moderation test” to enhance accessibility for non-academic readers. |
| Optional/General comments | This paper makes a valuable contribution to understanding youth entrepreneurship in Sub-Saharan Africa, especially by highlighting the role of digital outsourcing. |  |
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|  | **Reviewer’s comment** | **Author’s comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | No ethical issues are present; the study uses only publicly available secondary data (WBES and GEM) in full compliance with their usage terms. |