



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_29495
Title of the Manuscript:	ORGANISED CRIME, FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT AND ECONOMIC GROWTH 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	-Literature review on the subject should be extended. Authors may cite the results of the following paper which is also related to the paper and using a cointegration method: Karamanoglu, Yunus Emre, Akdi, Yilmaz and Sahin, Afsin (2014). "Unemployment by Education Status, Prices and Crime Relationship: Evidence from Turkey". Journal of Security Studies, Vol. 3, No. 2(November): 127-153. Links: http://www.jamyo.edu.tr/gbd/en/archieve.html http://www.jamyo.edu.tr/gbd/a/2014/sayi_2/makale_6.pdf -Actually I did not understand the model behind the paper. Real GDP is directly being effected from FDI and it is expected that crime would diminish the GDP and increase unemployment (as in Karamanoglu, Akdi and Sahin, 2014). But putting these economic variables in a same function should be explained better. -In Table 3 authors provide the Bounds testing results only. However the intermediate results should also be provided. Estimated coefficients are not given. -Authors initially provide bounds testing without providing the estimation results and conclude that there is a long-run relationship between variables. Next they claim that they are using ARDL method to estimate long-run relationship. I am not sure whether authors are in the correct order of estimation.	New empirical studies have been added to the text. All this been addressed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1) I think initially ARDL estimation equation results should be provided. I give an example of estimation equation for 2 fixed lags that is conducted in Eviews: $\text{LOGVTR} = \text{C}(1) * \text{LOGVTR}(-1) + \text{C}(2) * \text{LOGVTR}(-2) + \text{C}(3) * \text{UNCLOGMTR} + \text{C}(4) * \text{UNCLOGMTR}(-1) + \text{C}(5) * \text{UNCLOGMTR}(-2)$ 2) Second, Cointegrating and Long-Run Form Should be Provided such as: $\text{D}(\text{LOGVTR}) = \text{a1} * \text{D}(\text{LOGVTR}(-1)) + \text{a2} * \text{D}(\text{UNCLOGMTR}) - \text{a3} * \text{D}(\text{UNCLOGMTR}(-1)) - \text{a4} * (\text{LOGVTR} - (\text{a5} * \text{UNCLOGMTR}(-1)))$ 3) Third, ARDL bounds test results should be provided and F-statistics for bounds tests should be given. And these three steps should give the same results whether there is a long-run relationship or not. If there is long-run relationship, short run analysis may be conducted. -In Table 4, the coefficient of OC is significantly 0.08723 which means an increase in crime increases the growth rate. However authors interpret it as negative effect. -In Figure 1, the coefficients are not stable according to CUSUM test.	This also been addressed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-Where are equations 4 and 5. The equations used to estimate parameters should be provided.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-Language of the paper and conclusion section may be improved.	