

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_126977
Title of the Manuscript:	The Virtual International Exchange Of Extreme Productive Factors And Sustainability: Case Study Of An Efficient Educational Vector
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	This paper is essential as it has to do with the economy of nature which is actually a determinant to growth and sustainability. Consequently, nations could take lessons from the findings of the study on ways to improve their economy and the necessary adjustments to be made.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes it is	
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.	No. the abstract is not comprehensive. It is expected that it begins with a sentence that captures the aim of the study, study objectives, methodology, findings, conclusion and a key recommendation	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. the subsection didn't flow well. For instance, sampling came after findings. Furthermore, the objectives were not clearly stated	
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 utilized scientific models and data. The manuscript also dis a comparison of different countries ranging from developed to developing nations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references should be included	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. However, since it is an academic publication, the use of personal pronouns (I, We) should be expunged. It should be more like; the study discovered, taxations has been known or accepted to mean... etc	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ajayi David Oluwatoyosi
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic Bali, Nigeria