

Manuscript: **“The Corona Virus Pandemic And Stochastic Growth: Implications For Developed, Developing, And Emerging Economies”**

Submitted: 11 December 2020

Accepted: 17 February 2021

Published: 30 June 2021

Corresponding Author: Diana Loubaki

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p204

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Saverio Lovergine, INAPP and University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy

Reviewer 2: Daniel B. Hier, Missouri University of Science and Technology, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Saverio Lovergine	Email:
University/Country: INAPP and University of Rome “Tor Vergata”	
Date Manuscript Received: 21/01/2011	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: CORONA VIRUS AND STOCHASTIC GROWTH, A NETWORK APPROACH	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12101/20	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Using of long sentences about all the paper, it makes not quick and fluent reading; so, sometimes, the reading of methods is not clear. Furthmore, the logical sequence of the sections and the arguments are also not clear (see below "Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s)")</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions are too short, and it is not compensated by a good Recommendations.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate, but part of it are written before of references section.</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The theme of the paper is very important because Coronavirus is not only affecting the health of the populations, but also the economy of all States around the world.

Unfortunately I have to ask that it be revised with the formula "Return for major revision and resubmission".

This is because at the page 8 (of 26) there is this sentences:

“The article presentation is done like following, section II provides the theory, section III, the main results, section IV, the impact of the shock among connected countries and transmission risks generated, section V, studies risk impact on the international economy, section VI, provides the public policy promotion, section VII highlights numerical experiments of the theory elaborated and the conclusion is provided in section VIII.”

Instead, the chapters of the paper are:

II. The theory

III. Sudden shocks in connected countries and transmission risks

IV. Risk impact on the international economy

V. The social planner's intervention

V. Numerical experiments of the theory

VI. The macro-economics' empirical view of the theory

VI. Conclusion

Therefore, it makes the paper unclear and, as mentioned above, not easy to read and understand.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Daniel B. Hier	Email:
University/Country: Missouri University of Science and Technology, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 9 Feb 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 Feb 2021
Manuscript Title: CORONA VIRUS AND STOCHASTIC GROWTH: A NETWORK APPROACH	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 12101/20	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title is fine. I might prefer something like</i> The corona virus pandemic and stochastic growth: Implications for Developed, Developing and Emerging Economies	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Minor re-wording needed	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Careful editing needed. Abbreviations need checking i.e. not i.e Peak not pic, etc. Legends for figures are too brief. Need explanation of x-axis, y-axis, and scales	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
Nice mathematical presentation of methods	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
Results are clear. Updating statistics on the corona virus pandemic would be preferable through January 2021. The use of the possessive such as countries' is distracting. Try to rewrite without use of possessive.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion needs re-wording to be clearer. The main finding that the corona virus pandemic will affect developed economies more than emerging economies needs to be stated clearly. The finding that emerging economies will not lose ground on developed economies due to the pandemic needs to be explicitly stated.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
References seem fine	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is a scholarly piece of work. The author is likely multi-lingual with a good working knowledge of English and French. Some French words have crept into the text and need removal. Figures can be improved by addition of descriptive captions that explain the x-axis, y-axis, and trend lines. A few of the figures are too low resolution to be readable.