



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25083
Title of the Manuscript:	FROM THE “BATTLE OF THE SEXES” TO THE “END OF HISTORY AND THE LAST MAN” : AN ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT GLOBAL ECONOMIC CRISIS
Type of the Article	Review paper

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	Lots of problems with language use and grammar. The contributor should polish his expressions: some are not punctuated, indiscriminate use of capital letters without justification, excessive underlining, Joseph Schumpeter's creative destruction appears to be the pivotal concept of the article but he is not referenced anywhere in the Works cited section. Bibliography and references? Clearly, Works cited should be used as label because the dates appear at the end of the references. Entries do not show places of publication. Can names be entered beginning with 'Sir' ?	I have included the Schumpeterian assertions by adding an extra reference see: footnote six the reference: Enresto Screpanti & Stefano Zamagni: "An Outline of the History of Economic Thought", Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2001, pages 243-247. In the bibliography I have included the places where the books have been published. The underline parts have also been changed to italics. I do not believe that entries need the "Sir" in the beginning.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The HUMAN CIVILIZATION HAS SHIFTED FROM A HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE WHERE THE EPICENTER WAS THE HUMAN BEING TO A TECHNOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE WHERE THE EPICENTER IS A MACHINE. I am not persuaded that the human civilization has shifted from a humanistic to a technological perspective because the technological perspective, in itself, does not have life or spirituality. Throughout history, human civilization has had two dimensions, namely, the content and the form. The content is about the human, spiritual, cultural and the form is about technology, methods, etc It is not that human civilization itself has shifted, but that the focus on the dimensions has shifted and that is why	This is a very constructive comment and it has been included in the text see the lines 461-476 in page 12. However I make the point that it is the first time that artificial intelligence becomes more dominant compared to human intelligence. I believe that it is this trait that makes the current technological evolution unique compared to that of the past. And I believe that this may have negative ramifications in the future.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	capitalism is facing numerous challenges. It is simply inconceivable and impossible for human civilization to shift to technology because it would die. As far as I know, it is not yet dead!	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Fairly thoughtful paper. No indication of the area of specialty of the paper.	