

**Paper: “Sectorial Analysis of the U.S. and China Trade Conflict”**

**Submitted: 02 December 2020**

**Accepted: 18 January 2021**

**Published: 31 January 2021**

Corresponding Author: Tony Okafor

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p68

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: H.R.Izadi  
Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

Reviewer 2: Daniela Breveníková, Slovak Republic

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: <b>Dr.H.R.Izadi</b>	
University/Country: <b>Chabahar Maritime University/Iran</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: 2020, Des 22	Date Review Report Submitted: 2021, Jan 7
Manuscript Title: <b>U.S. and China Trade war: A macroeconomic Analysis</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>1276/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>results Should be improved</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

- 1- Some tables and figures do not have source, their sources should be written
- 2- I suggest changing the title if possible

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

See attached file

# *ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

*ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!*

Reviewer Name: Daniela Breveníková	
University/Country: Slovak Republic, European Union	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 December 2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: U.S. and China Trade War: A Macroeconomic Analysis	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 76.12.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] <b>1-5</b> [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title clearly and succinctly reflects the content of the paper.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The abstract (190 words) is well-written and it contains the information about the objects, method (descriptive method) and results of the research carried out by the authors.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><i>There are few grammatical errors; mistakes include mainly capitalization and punctuation. Comments are given below and in the paper after proofreading in the attachment.</i></p> <p><i>Spelling mistakes:</i></p> <p><i>p.1 capitalization in the title of the research paper</i></p> <p><i>p.3 capitalization (World Trade Organization)</i></p> <p><i>U.S -- either remove the comma, or write two commas (US / U.S.);</i></p> <p><i>Insert zero character after commas at the end of the sentence (several instances of this type of mistake)</i></p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The authors use the descriptive method of analysis (abstract) and explained in greater detail in chapter 3 (Data and Measurement). The authors characterize their approach to the topic as comparative, and (most of) their data are based on properly cited sources. The chronological presentation of developments related to the U.S. and China trade war in historical perspective is an adequate approach and it increases the clarity of the discourse.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Data are presented in 3 figures and 6 tables. Verbal presentation of results in is clear and unanimous, and it adequately points to problems involved. The authors also give recommendations for the improvement in the area of problems discussed in the paper.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Conclusions presented in the paper support the content of the paper.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>

*The references are comprehensive; however, they do not contain the sources of data used in tables. We appreciate that the sources in references come from the latest period (2019, 2020).*

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is interesting and well-written.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The paper is interesting and well-written.