



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1426
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>The Link between Remittances and Economic Growth in Pakistan: A Boon to Economic Stability</i>
Manuscript received on (Date)	
Review comment submitted (Date)	



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	Although the question raised by this paper is an interesting one, the paper was very difficult to read and understand.	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	Some results are surprising: "The level of investment has (...) a negative impact on economic growth in the long run". How can that be???	
Introduction	- It is too long; all the description of the Pakistani economy should be presented in another part. And this part should be organized. For instance, describe first the evolution of GDP, then of the BOP, and finally of remittances. Then you can show the correlation between GDP and remittances for example. - It is poorly organized: stylized facts on remittances and their importance are mixed with results on the consequences of remittances on development, growth, health, education... - Many sentences are not clear, due to lack of precision. For example, the results of studies are mentioned, but not the countries that were studied. Thus, we do not know if the results are theoretical or apply only to some countries. - Make sure to present the issue you are addressing in the paper in one paragraph, explaining why you need an empirical test to answer your question. - The last paragraph should present the organization of the paper. Start the paragraph with "This paper is an attempt..." (l.165)	
Review of literature (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	- It looks like a list of papers with no link between them. - This part must show what is already known on the link between remittances and growth and on the channels through which remittances may have an impact on growth. Explain the theoretical link between remittances and growth (for instance, the two last paragraphs of this part are not clear at all). It should underline the fact that some scholars have found a positive	



SDI Review Form 1.5

	impact of remittances on growth while other have found the opposite result. This is why it is useful to resort to an empirical test concerning Pakistan. Avoid repetitions with the introduction (l.218-220).	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.5

Materials & methods (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	- Why do you anticipate a positive impact of remittances on growth, since the results in the literature are ambiguous? - Notations and definitions keep changing (Y_t or Y_t? GFCF or GCF? EP or EXP?...; WR: workers' remittances or remittances as a percentage of GDP?...) - Why use a log-linear model in that case? - l.264: what does "L" means? This equation is useless since you study equ(iii) later on. - Justify the choice of the ARDL methodology. - l.289 and l.296: equations are missing - l.301: the matrix is not well written. - l.311: is the same "epsilon" as in equ(iii)? - l.320-321:??? - l.329: no error term? - l.332: what does ECM mean? Is it a variable, an error term? How is it calculated? - l.335: which coefficient? - l.336-339: this has already been explained in previous parts! - l.340-347: This must be explained earlier, when defining the first equation to explain growth.	
Results & discussion (Heading may differ in the case of review paper)	- Given the previously mentioned numerous shortcomings of the paper, I did not read the following parts carefully. Here are just some problems that caught my eyes. - In the tables, write down the real name of the variables. - l.381: how can a 1% increase in remittances induce a 42% increase in GDP????	
Conclusion		
References	- Some papers cited in the text are missing (l.197), some are repeated twice (l.568-570) - All deserve to be cited on a new line (l.521) - Some important references on the issue of remittances must be cited (for instance, authors like F. Docquier and H. Rapoport who wrote a whole chapter on the subject in The Handbook on the economics of giving, altruism and reciprocity, 2006)	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer