

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.	I dislike as it is not up to the standard of the scientist research. The title is not bad, but the title and the detail work is connected as the manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	THE VIRTUAL INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF EXTREME PRODUCTIVE FACTORS AND SUSTAINABILITY. Case study part is not required as the author doesn't discussed about education vector in the study.	
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. The reader need to understand overall concept of your manuscript from abstract. I suggest to include how you conduct your research (Methodology), the main finding of your research, contribution or implication of the study. Your abstract looks like introduction.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not appropriate: the paper has to be structured as follows: abstract, introduction, literature, methodology, finding and discussion, conclusion (theoretical and managerial contribution, limitation and future work).	
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.	---	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not sufficient and recent. And all references have no DOI.	
Minor REVISION comments	Ok.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Terefe Alemu
Department, University & Country	Zhengzhou University, China