



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 (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. The title could be: "Possible model regarding the review of the competitive firm's theory". And this aspect, due to the fact that the author, in the large part of the paper, he is drawing a mathematical model in order to reconstruct the above-mentioned theory. 2. The abstract is too abstracted. Minimum 100 words and a synthesis of what we have as theoretical background, the necessity of this new mathematical model and, finally, the scope and importance in practice of this model. 3. In Introduction, it is necessary, however, a review of the literature, ideas and theories in the field. References inserted, either into brackets, or as footnotes. The perfect competition, in fact the Neoclassical form of the theory of competition (the 3rd pillar of an open market), has features and impacts over the theory and practice in Economics, issue included in the works of some very important thinkers. 4. Also, before starting the stages of drawing the mathematical model, it is necessary a short subchapter presenting the <i>methodology</i> the author is going to use in the paper. 5. After presenting the entire model proposed (in too large measure, my opinion), I expected that this one to be put in practice on a simulation, in order to see the advantages of this new conception about the perfect competition and the Neoclassical theory	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(sort of finding). More as, the author speaks about a bicentennial error regarding the perception of the capitalist market. And, by this model, it is necessary to see exactly the improvements of this approach. 6. BUT, the main problem with the Conclusions is that of highlighting exactly the results and, furthermore, what to do continuing in this respect. There are ambiguous forms of expression as the following: “efficient explanations are a prerequisite to efficient predictions....to establish efficient criteria...”; “and, in any case, to ensure that the general competitive equilibrium takes place, in the ultimate goal, due to its attribute of social efficiency”{so be it?}; “ no more, no less, the core that has been injured (?) by the results exposed here” (which practical results?); “The bicentenary error alluded to in the title of this article...”(it was better to say bicentenary error general in Economics-the theory of the firm appeared closer to our days). And so on, there still few such expressions. 7. Of course, the Neo-classical general theory has failures in arguing the necessity of reaching the perfect competition and general equilibrium. But, in nowadays, we can see that those assumptions are for long time forgotten and the New Economy is looking for new features, instruments, in order to support the realities of the TNCs domination in the world, but also to necessity to insert the human resource in this new pattern. Also, in Conclusions part, we suggest that the references must be avoided, because there are only the author opinions and findings.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	In fact moderate comments linked to the necessity of a quick English revision of the text, especially in order that the author's opinions to be more clear understood and put in correlation with the mathematical complex model.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Alexandru Trifu</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Faculty of Economics, University "Petre Andrei" of Iasi, Romania</i>