



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Para of conclusion in abstract in "should" form. 2. Last line of conclusion should be completed for the clear outcome of the policy. 3. Line 29 (greatest threats to economic growth). 4. Line 38 (reference required). 5. Identify the "Literature review with heading". 6. Line 74 (parenthesis error). 7. Line 81 (clarify what two factors?). 8. Give detail(s) of scheme of study, probably at the end of the Section of Introduction. 9. Line 97 (specify the correct time period). Refer to the abstract i.e. 2000 to 2014. 10. Define the "< >" signs. 11. In methodology section, explain for 1) why ARDL? 2). Give detailed version of ARDL. 3). Detail the Unit root test. 12. For better skewness explanation, refer to pure statistical explanation w.r.t shape of the diagram on respected variable. 13. Explain Kurtosis & give Jarque-Bera results also. 14. Line 132-37 move to ARDL methodology section. 15. Line 156-158, "improve drafting". Avoid the repeat of word 'because'. 16. Explain the results of unit root in brief. 17. Line 172, (as shown). 18. Line 189, give foot note and elaborate the expected signs/hypothesis. 19. Give the signs of coefficients according to elaboration i.e. OC is neg. to eco. Growth, so sign should be negative in Table 4. Elaboration and signs	1. This has been corrected. 2. This has also been addressed. 3. This has been addressed in the manuscript. 4. The reference has been provided. 5. The literature review has been given a title. 6. The parenthesis has been dealt with. 7. The two factors were used in addition to other factors in the growth equation. 8. This was well taken. 9. The signs have been explained. 10. This has been addressed. 11. The ARDL version provided included both the long run and short run equations. The unit root test has been a detailed discussion.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	are not consistent in table and in equation. 20. Give equation for short run results also. 21. In results and discussion give critical subject-based reasoning i.e. “why <i>positive</i> or <i>negative</i>”. 22. Don’t repeat Table 5 in line 241. 23. Line 248, (results show). 24. Be more elaborative on long run results than on short run. 25. Line 350, (indicated). 26. Line 357, “to fight”. 27. Policy recommendations should not be straight forward in rendering the self-thought outcomes. • Do sectioning of the entire manuscript. • Furbish stylised facts in Tables in Introduction Section. • Focus on economic growth since it is the regressand and highlight problem statement with significance and scope of the present study in succinct. • Add some more literature, if possible and critically analyse it. • In Methodology section, discuss methodologies one by one and in Results section, explain results only.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Improve drafting. • Avoid repeat of same information again and again (refer to point 15). Spelling issues.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Own the article seriously	