



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_20524
Title of the Manuscript:	Managing costs for Iraq's Reconstruction and Recovery
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The introduction section does not contain any references. Normally, introduction sections should provide pertinent background. This background is presented in the context of other works related to the subject of discussion. While the author(s) has/have discussed some background, I cannot tell whether these ideas discussed in the introduction are solely the views of the author(s) or those accumulated from authors(s) of similar articles/literature. Also, I cannot underpin the aim/objective of the study. This should be explicitly stated in the introduction. Author(s) should also make a statement on the justification for the study. The methodology should be re-written in reported speech. Normally, the methodology sections should present how the reported study was carried out, possibly identify relevant principles that support the methods adopted. None of the references listed were cited. This should be corrected.	I totally agree with the reviewer and therefore, several references were added to the introduction in the attempt to highlight the background situation in Iraq and also put emphasis on my ideas. Also, the aim of the study was stated in a clearer manner, while a justification of the study was added in the introduction. Furthermore, I have re-written the methodology, adding more information to support my study. Even though I have used information from all the sources listed, I have not cited them, but now I have modified the study and there are several references cited.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		