



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_18567
Title of the Manuscript:	THE NEXT ECONOMY IN UKRAINE: DEVELOPING ALTERNATIVE ENERGY WITH THE HELP OF NBIC-TECHNOLOGIES
Type of the Article	Review 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	No	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors didn't prove economic efficiency of any NBIC-technology usage. No idea about it emerged during the paper. However, economic evaluations must be crucial for those technologies to make their application rampant. So, the paper needs some economic proof, for example, about hydrogen generation and storage. I think, the title The Next ECONOMY requires some economic approach :))	Yes, I put in the economic evaluation of the use of nanotechnologies (as the main material component of NBIC-technology) for an energetic sector, including hydrogen generation and storage: Line 219 to the line 240
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	At my view, Tables 3 and 4 needn't so many columns, it would rather to convert the last two of them into verbal comments after the Tables.	Yes I agree. I make corrections in these tables reviewer