



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_31353
Title of the Manuscript:	Measuring real equilibrium interest rate – from Taylor rule linear equation to Agent – based model
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. There exists no balanced relationship between the objective, content and conclusion of the manuscript. There is even no "Conclusion". 2. The research methods and the data collection techniques are not adequately explained. The section "Data and Methodology" does not even exist. 3. The manuscript is not well-written. 4. The results of the analysis are not correctly interpreted.	1. I agree. I am working on improvement of the relationship between objective, content and conclusion. I do not agree that there is no conclusion. The conclusion was made. 2. The data collection and the methodology had been explained in the relevant sections. According to compulsory revision comment I added separate section "Data and methodology". 3. Agree. I am working on improvement. 4. Regarding interpretation of the results of the analysis I have my own opinion. If you have found serious mistakes, please, indicate. Different economic schools interpret the same economic data differently. There are unsettled debates among economists. Milton Friedman rejected the analyses that prove business-cycle theory. Austrian School battled Keynesians for intellectual supremacy and so on.
Minor REVISION comments	5. The manuscript is not free of issues of grammar, punctuation and such: a) P.1 last sentence: interest rate behaviour. b) P.3 paragraph 2: This paper will identifies c) P.4 third paragraph: Ben Bernanke written d) P.5 last paragraph to reveal reveal	5. I have made corrections and gave the draft of the working paper to my colleague for proofreading. If it is not enough I will find professional proofreader.
Optional/General comments		