

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_100106
Title of the Manuscript:	Skill Sets For Future Hospitality Jobs
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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript will be of great important to the scientific community if literature is broadened. As it is, literature is not adequate.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable</p> <p>No. The abstract reveals frequent problems of matching singular and plural verbs and subjects; as well as making the sentences readability difficult. Also, the abbreviations should be written out in full in the first mention for clarity and comprehension and maybe abbreviated subsequently.</p> <p>No, the sub sections and structure of the manuscript is scanty as it has only two (2) main sub-sections. The manuscript should present the state of things in the hospitality industry presently and compare that with what is happening in other parts of the world and also the future.</p> <p>No. The manuscript is not scientifically correct as it lacks empirical evidence (s). The manuscript as it is remains an opinion paper.</p> <p>Most of the references are recent and appears sufficient. However, the quantum of references is not reflected in the content of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. the language/ English quality is not entirely appropriate for scholarly communication. There should be marked improvement in the use of prepositions, punctuations marks, present and past tenses.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There is no evidence to support conclusion. The manuscript is using both Forth Industrial Revolution and 21st century. There is need to maintain consistency in the era the study is interested in.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	David Asuquo Edet
Department, University & Country	Cross River University of Technology, Nigeria