



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20523
Title of the Manuscript:	Iraq's trade import and export patterns and their repercussions
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Except that this article did not specifically acknowledge work of other Author(s) used otherwise referred to as in-text citation, this manuscript would have been accepted as it is. Though there is a list of references as a section, normally, sources of work of others should be acknowledged specifically in the body of the work. Perhaps, if the Journal Administration accepts this style, then this paper may be accepted as it is, if not then kindly provide such acknowledgement in the body of the article and do that meticulously. Also, in line 181, do you actually mean ' dates '? Just be sure.	I understand and I have made several changes, acknowledging the work of other authors that I have used in the body of my study. On the other hand, in line 181 I was referring to dates as the fruits of the date palm (<i>Phoenix dactylifera</i>). Unfortunately, I have not found a proper synonym, so I hope it is understandable if I leave it like this.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		