



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_33194
Title of the Manuscript:	A CRITICAL REVIEW OF COMPETITIVE FIRM'S THEORY
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract of the manuscript is totally inadequate. Mere two sentences of the abstract are absolutely insufficient. Within the abstract, it is necessary clearly to define the objectives of the study, the methods of their achievement, own contribution to the solved topic and briefly to formulate research conclusions. This paper is not formally correct even, several words merge together at various locations and so, the manuscript is virtually impossible to read. Quality search of already existing knowledge with references to contemporary literature is totally absent in the introductory chapter. The introductory chapter contains the objectives of the paper, but not the methods and procedures leading to their achievement. Formulas are scattered in the text (somewhere in the middle of page, somewhere on the left, and somewhere completely different), some figures are blurred. The sources used lack under figures, for example "Source: Own research".	1. The problem was caused by converting the text to another version of Word. However, it has been corrected. 2. It has been reduce from 36 to 19 pages. 3. The English of the whole article has been meticulously corrected. 4. The abstract has been corrected. 5. The references have been updated and extended.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		