



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7713
Title of the Manuscript:	Illusory, conditional and actual indicators in economic management
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The paper needs serious revisions and especially methodological responses for econometric and statistic tests to be validated or published... 1. There is a certified number of indicators. But the author of the paper must clarify the distinction between the number of determinations and the number of definitions in the section entitled Material and methods 2. The regression must be described in a classical way $Y = f(x) + \varepsilon$ and not in an incredible and ambiguous manner like this: "Then $\beta_{qkn} = B_1$. The regression equation for the relationship shown in Fig. 1b is by $6,55 n + 155,32$, then $\beta_{qkn} = 6,55 n + 155,32$. Given that the $155,32 / n$ with increasing n tends to zero, it indicates that the $\beta_{qk} = 6,55$." 3. The author must present and detail the software used to estimate the parameters (if he or she has used one) and all the mandatory econometric or statistic tests that validate the regression model... 4. There still remains a formal but profound question for the author: the paper presents two laws or two	Statistical criteria, by which an inspection was carried out, are specified in article (Durbin-Watson statistic). One of the formulas complicating the perception was excluded. The regression equation is presented in the classical form. Used software Microsoft Office Excel 2010 is pointed. Indicated that the two rules (not laws) received. Indication of the nature the curve fluctuations Figures 1a introduced. The conclusion, as far as possible, expanded.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	rules? This essential aspect must be clarified in abstract and detailed in the content of the article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	If it is not a grammatical error in the next text It would be logical to assume that by the accumulation of statistical data average values should fluctuate around some value... (WHY NOT SOME VALUES?) perhaps the hypothesis must be detailed and clarified. Could be the constant of the two laws explained as an algebraic limit for some aggregate values? This could offer the real character of a law rather in a mathematical way than in an econometrical way if it is possible... The section of conclusion is indeed a brief one, maybe too short and without detailed consequences in the reality of management and economics The final section must be extended. .	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	If the author of the paper can change the abstract, respond inside the paper to the questions and finally adapt initial text to the formal and substantial requirements expressed in SDI review form the article can be published (with those revisions in all final sections) Even the references must be extended and rewrite using some econometric and informatics resources ... and literature there are no econometric or statistic validations for the so called laws or rules presented in the	