



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20562
Title of the Manuscript:	Results of Foresight-Research of Development Nanotechnology Industry for the Next Economy in Ukraine
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract of this manuscript is written very carefully and it is sufficiently reliable. The same can be stated regarding the key words. This manuscript has a logical layout and its content is very interesting. It brings a number new findings. I can basically only recommend to insert a chapter devoted to the overview of research of already knowledge known in this field from other sources, as the theme of nanotechnology is very topical especially now. The paper includes a rich list of references.	<i>Thank you for such a warm feedback on our work. We would like to note that this article is a summary of our research and fair comment reviewer on adding chapters about the existing research in this area- reflected in our previous work, so we decided that this article will contain only a reference to them [13 - 19].</i>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I can recommend to insert the source used under each table or figure, for example: "Source: own research", so that the results of own research of authors and knowledge adopted have been carefully separated. It is necessary that each table is only on one page, while some tables are on two pages. Some gap is missing under some tables (for examples Tables 3 and 4) and the titles of some subchapters are on two pages, too (for example the subchapter 3.2).	<i>All your remarks were taken into account - correction in the text are highlighted in yellow.</i>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		