



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25092
Title of the Manuscript:	MACROECONOMIC FACTORS AND INDUSTRIAL PERFORMANCE IN GHANA
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Please clarify the ethical issue if any	There was no ethical issue
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Not mention how the study organized as paragraph in introduction - The aim of this study unclear in introduction - The contribution of author is unclear - I prefer to write about Ghana development indicators in separate topic after introduction topic - I prefer to add studies in 2014 and 2015 and also not mention any paper between 2000 to 2009. - The results need to compare with other previous studies - The last four references must citation as scientific method - The format of references must be consolidated as one form.	We have revised our manuscript to include how the study was organised as paragraph in introduction. The aim of this study was clearly stated and therefore we disagree with the comments of the reviewer. Also, we agree with the reviewer for we have not added studies between 2009 to 2015, and compared with other previous studies. We have therefore revised our manuscript in accordance with the views of the reviewer. Finally, the issue with the format of references has been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		