



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30175
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT ON THE ECONOMY: CASE OF THE ZAMBIA
Type of the Article	Review paper

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		
Minor REVISION comments	1- The Abstract: provide sufficient background information for readers but not enough Statistics. 2-Grammatical mistakes to correct in the astract: (1) Invest... / Correct ----investment (2) to multitudes / Correct ---of multitudes (3) the level to which or the quality of benefits it brings along that is questionable (to rewrite it in more obvious way). 3- Methology and results : The author also have tried to present some experimental results using the time series in analysing the data of FDI against that of GDPGR in Zambia. Unfortunately, the methodology is not effective and can't be improved. The paper, however, seems to be unclear along several lines and weak.	1- Thank you. Some adjustments in the abstract have been made as suggested here. 2- (1) thank you. Rightly taken care of. (2) thank you for this correction. However Instead of "of multitudes" as suggested, I've realized that initially it was supposed to be "by multitudes" so it has been replaced as such. (3)It has been made clearer, thank you for observation. 3-"...is not effective and can't be improved..." I'm sorry but I don't understand this VALUABLE comment. However the corrections on the time series part are not necessary now as the tittle of the paper has changed
Optional/General comments		