



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12601
Title of the Manuscript:	Macroeconomic Analyze in forecasting of States economic growth and International Labor Migration Dynamic
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The significant of the study is not strong to answer the question why researcher does this topic. 2. The contribution of this paper is not clear. 3. The factors used in this paper in not cover all factors.	1. Fully agreed. Abstract corrected by author 2. I made a new chapter – RESULTS (practical and theoretical). Objectives of the study were corrected (in better relationship with conclusions and results) 3. Fully agreed with reviewer. Modern economy has many extra factors for economic growth. But by my own opinion all these modern factors (such as quality of management, entrepreneurship, innovations, presence of MNC (for example, by approaches of Drucker, Porter, Krugman and so on)) have only 3 kinds of origins – natural, human and financial. For example, entrepreneurship is defined by financial institutes development, innovations – by humanitarian infrastructure. Finally, Krugman said that studying of International economy is a kind of studying Geography)))) And I can be disagreed with him))))). So if my dear reviewer allows me I prefer to keep only 3 classic factors for economical growth to be considered.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Writing Style: should write a nicely paragraph not a piece of sentence see line 37-46 , 171-176, 180, and all in conclusion. 2. Table heading Line 150 should move to the next page 3. Table heading Line 263 should move to the next page 4. Reference in Line 366 has not shown in the text.	1. 37-46 – I prefer to keep a numbered structure for better understanding and to be more noticeable; 171-180 – corrected, conclusion – I prefer to keep numbered structure for better understanding a relationship between conclusion and introduction. 2. Corrected 3. Corrected 4. Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Would like to express my deep gratitude to dear reviewer for reading my paper, its evaluation, for every comment and correction! Wish You all the bests!