



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_36828
Title of the Manuscript:	Carving up the market: The golden rule of seven
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>)

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	Research objective is clear. Author has described research objective in Introduction clearly, but there is no methodology explanation in this paper. Author should discuss about research method and the theoretical underpinning of the research. Companies in this world do various strategies and ways to meet their own interests. For example, the rhetorical monopoly is to operate efficiently, but in a fact, the company have a goal to can determine the price according to its wish. The merger of a company with another company with the purpose of synergy, the fact is to eliminate competition and manipulate prices.	Section "methods and methodology" added to make it clear that all research is based on those (analytical) methods given there. I did not analyze any morality of the system in the research since it is not quantifiable. Only a simple mathematical assumption was made (Smith's Invisible Hand): Everybody acts in self interest, which means for persons: more wealth for money, and for companies: more profit. Some text has been added to discuss the act of competition elimination and price manipulation.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The author should add empirical evidence in discussing the invalidity of Invisible Hand theory in the free market (liberalism). Empirical evidence should be presented to strengthen the discussion.	First of all, it is (now) explicitly stated that it is not an empirical work but fully analytical. Moreover, the subject is not the Invisible Hand per se, but more of the sort "what happens if it <i>is</i> correct". The (invalidity of the) theory of the Invisible Hand is too big of a subject for the modest researcher that I am to be single-handedly validated or invalidated by me. Indeed, a lot can be said for the invalidity of the Invisible Hand. Moreover, many agents act not in self-interest. Many authors (of which Marx is the most famous) have argued that the Invisible Hand in a free market leads to ruin. It was no intention of me to throw myself into this discussion.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should add references coming from scientific journals	Some references have been added (esp. to address the points mentioned above by the referee).