



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_24230
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Integration Problem of Turkey: An Evaluation about Shangai Cooperation Organization within the Frame of Alternative Searches
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	This is a very clearly written, nicely conducted study that discussing economic integration status of Turkey to evaluate whether Turkey should join the Shanghai Cooperation Organization or not. The introduction provides a good, generalized background of the topic that quickly gives the reader an understanding of the relevant issues. The description of the economic integration is quite clear, and is appropriate for the study. This study would be likely to make a contribution in understanding how Turkey has put efforts in promoting itself as an active member both in the global and regional economic circles if the data could be analyzed and interpreted in a more carefully thought out way. The review of the literature on issues of global and regional economic integration and Turkey's role in these integrations are not well connected with the assessment and final conclusion of the study. The assessment criteria whether Turkey should join SCO or not need to be clearly stated. The author didn't mention anything about the criteria in the study. For example, lines 457-561 should be the assessment part and is the most important part of	1- In the conclusion Turkey's role is discussed. About participating in new integration besides the integrations that Turkey is already in, the membership for SCO is discussed in case of being unsuccessful at getting in EU; and it's stated that EU membership is a better move for Turkey rather than a SCO membership according to the democracy index. 2- Democracy index is used as the criteria of the study. Lines: 459-468. 3- Sections 5 and 6 in the study are consistent now. Lines: 459-468.; 4- Data in the study is not enough alone to analyze Turkey's integration problem. However the question whether SCO is an alternative for EU is evaluated by using the democracy index as a guide. Lines: 459-468 ; 589-490 5- The citations for tables has been



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the study. However, this part and previous sections needs to be connected. In addition, the information or data used in the assessment are not well cited. This will affect how the data will be analyzed and how the conclusion will be interpreted. The biggest challenge in this study is the assessment part. It seems that the way the data was analyzed here makes the interpretation of the findings problematic and even somewhat misleading. Without the connections with theories or criteria, it seems like the discussion part is more related to the authors' personal opinions. It is too subjective.	checked, and no mistake has been seen regarding these. Comments on Tables have been added, and the explanations have been corrected by moving them before the tables as suggested in the reference guidelines. 6- Integration theories have been added in the study Lines: 164-168
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 4 : Shangai? Or Shanghai? From line 198 to line 457, there are section 4 and section 6. Where is section 5? Line 562 Conclusion – is it should be section 7? Some citations and references are missing. Line 69,. C.P Kindleberger emphasizes...(reference?) Line 71, According to Tingerben (reference?) Line 92, Viner’s study (reference?) Line 111, Economic integration was first brought forward by Bela Balassa in 1961 (Andrei, 2012). Why not cite (Balassa, 1961)? Since Balassa has been cited in line 91.... Lines 188- 194 need citations and references Please follow the journal’s Author Guideline and its reference guideline.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please follow the journal’s Author Guideline and its reference guideline.	