



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19763
Title of the Manuscript:	Bitcoin: main trends and perspectives*
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	The abstract should be reviewed. The abstract is not logical and coherent; it excluded study findings, the author's position and recommendation based of the study (lines 5 -8).	Reviewed, edited, new sources added. New Abstract as per example: Article describes modern history of private money emergence, principal laws that govern functioning of cryptocurrencies and relations that characterize it. Formulates prospects of Bitcoin as an alternative unit of exchange and identify reasons for its possible restriction in Russia and other countries.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In line 30, "In the last year...." the year should be specified and should be referenced. Also, there is reference number 1, 3, 4 and so on but no place where reference number 2 appears (see lines 13 - 46). I think it was omitted. Paragraphs in the introductory part should be revisited. They are not logically coherent, though they have meaningful justification.	Year is specified and referenced; reference numbers corrected. Introduction part reviewed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the result section: Line 90: "Accordingly to the displayed chart..." It should be according to the displayed chart. However, the chart number is not specified. I think the word 'picture' should be replaced with figure and source should be provided. The Bibliography section does not conform to referencing standards. It should be reviewed.	Line 90 corrected, chart number specified, spelling corrected. Bibliography section reviewed.