



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_10536
Title of the Manuscript:	REINVESTIGATING THE EXPORT-LED GROWTH EVIDENCE IN MALAYSIA: BOUND TEST APPROACH
Type of the 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. The theoretical relationship exports and economic growth was missing in the paper. This theoretical argument are relevant to establish a good premise for which exports drives economic growth. 2. In contrast to the export-led growth hypothesis, it can also be argued that causality runs from the growth of output to the growth of exports. This argument was equally missing from the study. 3. The methodology on causality was not also clear. First, the author did not explain causality and whether the standard Granger test is applied or the VECM. Second, the wald statistic was not provided by the author which, but he or she said the causality test was based on the wald. The author simply reported the short-run coefficients and indicated they were the wald statistic.	-Theoretical relationship included -Methodology has been improved. -This research does not apply granger causality test. We used bound test to estimate short run and long run elasticities.
Minor REVISION comments	All topographical errors such as line 30 (Reinhardt N. (2000) and Mahadevan R. (2007) have similar opinio with orthodox school that), the word opinion is wrongly	All correction done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	spelt. Line 153 reads coefficients of economic growth, inequality, investment and public expenditure. However, there is extraneous material that has no bearing on the current study. In line 158 the author labelled table 1 as CI. That should be corrected accordingly. Line 163 reads "rejected and we conclude that there is no long-run relationship between poverty and its". This is another extraneous material since the study is about export and growth. On the results of cointegration the author failed to indicate the relevant critical values for the lower and upper values before comparing them to the F-statistic.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study lacks fundamental theoretical basis and unclear causality methodology. The principal issue which is the causality was not given adequate attention in the study. This leaves a reader in confusion as to whether the author is applying the standard causality test or other methods of causality.	Thank you for valuable comments.