

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_126975
Title of the Manuscript:	MULTIDIMENSIONAL TRADE THEORY: PRODUCTIVE FACTORS' VIRTUAL MOVEMENTS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 very poorly drafted, everything is in first person, please address in 3 <sup>rd</sup> person. Topic also seems to be incomplete. Very cumbersome task for readers to understand the paper. Methodology is also barely comprehensible.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title lacks clarity. Make it something like Neo- Sustainable Approach to trade theory : Study of Virtual Movement of Productive Factors	
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.	Not Appropriate at all, please redraft it. It lack comprehensibility and write in academic fashion not like declaration.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Sub sections hardly follows any witing style, moreover the whole document seems like a homework assignment.	
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.	Scientifically the author has tried to derive some methodology and challenge a theory, which seems a good idea but it is poorly drafted and conceptualised. Methodology is not robust and scientifically backed by previous studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No very old references have been presented. Latest its seems is of 2012. Additionally no recognised citation style has been followed.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please redraft the paper, your idea may not convincing enough due to lack of clarity and an incomprehensible writing style.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please reconsider your work in new approach.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Aman Shreevastava</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Purnea University, India</b>