

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_126018
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cross-generation and cross-country evidence on productive factors' virtual movements</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES it is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is not comprehensive enough since the methodology and the data employed are not explicitly stated in the abstract. Also, abstract is suppose to be written in past tense.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript requires a bit of adjustments. 1. Background should follow introduction before the motivation subsection. There is no methodology section and the conclusion can have a summary and recommendations subsection. These maybe clearly spelt out or paragraphed under the conclusion subheading.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript follows a scientific process and utilised data and scientific method of data analysis in arriving at their conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are undated and as such not recent in anyway. Furthermore, the references are not adequate neither are they sufficient. There should be more citations and references which are recent. Surprised that there are no references dating 2020 or more recent.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, however, the language has to be in the third person since it is a report. The paper is different from the person writing the paper. As such, the author should have written, "the study investigated so so and so," instead of writing that "I investigated so so and so."	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It is a quality piece of research if all the points of correction mentioned above can be given due consideration.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Joel
Department, University & Country	Federal University Wukari, Nigeria