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 author have to recheck all citation that included in the manuscript because I found that many citation in the text are not appear in the references, for example see the detail in line 21 (Emilio, J.2001) which appeared in the text but not show in the reference and also in the line 24 (Khalafalla and Webb 2001), line 29 (Zulkarnain Yusop et.al, 2005), line34 (Ghatak and Price 1997); Line 43 (Nasim and Turkhan Ali 2004) line 60 ((Vitor Trindade 2005) line 67 (Khawaja and Hiranya 2005) line 72 (Tang 2006) line204 (Narayan 2005) line226 (Shin 1999) line269 (Shah and Yusoff 1990 and Ghatak and Price 1997) which appeared in the text but still are not appeared in the reference. 2. On the other hand, some of the references are not appear in the text. 3. The author should recheck the format of writing especially the format of citation and reference. For example in the line 323 if you have to cite the name of authors more than 3 persons you don't need to cite all names but you should write only the first author's name e.g. Narayan, P.K. et.al. 2007.	Citation has been added and rechecked Thank you very much for your details.
Minor REVISION comments	1. The author should add more comment or suggestion in the summary .	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	1.The result is very simple , should make it difference from the others, look like to show only testing the model . I am not sure because many citations as I mentioned above not show in the reference. It seems to me the author might be copy the citation from other papers and didn't read the original article. For example the author cite Emillio J. 2001 in the text but the author didn't read the article of Emillio J. 2001 directly but the author take from the article which already cite in their paper.	