



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19532
Title of the Manuscript:	PROSPECTS FOR CREATING MATERIAL GROUNDS FOR INFORMATION ECONOMICS ON THE BASIS OF MICRO-ELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGIES AND SENSOR ENGINEERING UTILIZING NBIC-TECHNOLOGIES IN UKRAINE
Type of the Article	Short 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		
Minor REVISION comments	-The abstract is very developed (there are many sections in the abstract; the authors should synthesize information's.) -The information's presented in tables 1 and 2 can be synthesize L301: it's 3.2 and not 3 on the title of this section	Thank you for the comments made, but at the same time, we have some concerns, please note that the reviewer. When writing the abstract, we have tried to comply with all the rules and traditions of the BJEMT. As you can see, all of the articles that are published in this journal, have the same structure and volume abstract. We think that in this article the structure and volume of abstracts is designed in accordance with the requirements and practices of the journal. In this connection, ask the reviewer to consider our views and leave abstract unchanged. Synthesis of Tables 1 and 2 will be difficult, because it is on the results of various scientific and technical programs. Common in these tables is the only review period - 2008-2012. In our opinion, the combination of these two tables will result in cumbersome and inconvenient for perception presents the results of two different research programs. We ask the reviewer to allow leave to present the results of the two programs in different tables. L301: Yes, we agree, it is 3.3. Corrections made.
Optional/General comments		