



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30613
Title of the Manuscript:	PROSPECTS FOR WORLDS&UKRAINE'SINFORMATION ECONOMY IN CREATING AND IMPROVING SUPERCOMPUTERS BASED OF NBIC-TECHNOLOGIES
Type of the Article	Short 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Lines 20, 21 and 22: Follow proper citation guidelines of Surname, (Year) Line 27: The use of <i>et al</i> should be corrected. Lines 25,26 and 27: Use correct citations. <i>Et al</i> is not correctly used in Line 27. Line 33: Provide a chronology of the structure of your paper. Line 40: What does others mean? Be specific. Line 97: NTUU needs to be written in full first before the acronym. Line 100: You may use <i>For instance</i> instead of <i>E.g.</i> Line 115 and 116: What is the source of this statement? Line 182: Do you mean Mathematic or Mathematical? Line 186: Which scholars have done work on this? Lines 196 and 197: What is the source of the information? Line 230: Who did the statistics and where is the evidence? Line 237 -243: Consider breaking into shorter sentences. Methods: How was qualitative data obtained and from which source document as reflected in lines 43-46? How did you utilise the science of content analysis in the results section? Despite the scientific nature of the paper, the philosophy of science in it is not coming out well. Please clarify: Regarding lines 43-46, where were these	Lines 20, 21 and 22: All references made in accordance with the requirements of the BJEMT. Line 27: Article corrected Lines 25, 26 and 27: Article corrected Line 33: I don't quite understand what is meant by the reviewer. Line 40: Article corrected Line 97: Article corrected Line 100: (new line 101) Article corrected Line 115 and 116: (new line 114 and 117) Article corrected Line 182: (new line 183) Article corrected Line 186: (new line 189) Article corrected Lines 196 and 197: (new line 198 and 199) Article corrected Line 230: (new line 234) Article corrected Line 237 -243: (new line 239-247) Article corrected Methods: In preparing the articles used qualitative analytical reports and quantitative data from Ukrainian statistical bulletins, Ukrainian National Academy of Science reports Please clarify: These documents (namely, Ukrainian statistical bulletins, Ukrainian



SDI Review Form 1.6

	documents obtained? Did it require permission of access?	National Academy of Science reports) are free and do not require any permission for their use when quoting.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Improve your English by revisiting every sentence in the text. What limitations did you meet when carrying out this study? Which areas of further research do you envisage in this paper?	We thank the referee for meticulously reviewing the paper and valuable comments. During this study we were faced with limited information about the results of development of supercomputers in Ukraine. We therefore believe that our paper can arouse the interest of researchers working in this area. In the future we hope to conduct a comparative analysis of the latest developments in the field of creation of supercomputers in the USA, EU, Japan, South Korea, China, Russia, and Ukraine. This will allow to determine the technical level of Ukrainian developments and to identify ways of further improving supercomputers SKIT.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Citations and English language need to be improved upon. The paper is technically sound but should be improved upon by addressing the above shortfalls How is the author connected to the department that conducted the research? What about sponsorship or grant? Were there any assistants?	We tried to make adjustments to our quote and English in accordance with the reviewers' comments. All remarks of the reviewer were taken into account. The respective adjustment of the text of the article. A study conducted by the authors on their own, without any sponsors or grants, and without any assistants.