



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1673
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbon Dioxide Emissions, Energy Consumption and Economic Growth in Saudi Arabia: A Multivariate Cointegration Analysis.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



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:	I do not like the structure of the paper. Section V, with the empirical results, is interesting but from my point of view the Conclusions are a bit poor. Relevant information about the specific data used in the analysis is missing. Section III is too long. This seems not to be a theoretical paper but an applied one... so the length of these theoretical aspects is excessive.	Relevant information about the specific data used in the analysis is provided now. Section iii has been modified now
Specific comments:	The Literature review is full of mistakes, Safiq (1994) and Bruyn et al (1998) are cited in the text but not in the references list; Fodha and Zahdoud (in the text) are Fodha and Zaghdoud in the reference list... and there are some other mistakes like this. The references list is full of mistakes. See for instance: Line 391: Author/s are not included Line 396: 'Our common feature' should be 'Our common future'. Line 404: "AN empirical" should be "An empirical" ... They use in the references different and confusing citation styles. See for instance: Line 389, this is a journal article (Only surnames and initial are used) Line 428: again a journal article (names and surnames are used) Some years in the references are between brackets some others not. The spacing of words is full of mistakes, maybe this is a problem with the PDF conversion but they should be careful ... See for instance: Line 78, 87, 145, 190, 194, 267, 280, 281, 323, 356, 362, ...	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected
Title and abstract	The title is Ok.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Yes, the problem is reasonably well defined	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Too many references. As I have stated some of the references in the text are not cited in the references list.	Corrected
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	I am not specialist in the used method but it seems to be correctly used. Anyway, they give too much information about the technique in the text...., because this seems to be an applied research. Or not?	Methodology used in this study is well established in the literature
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide	- The origin of the data has not been defined. - They provide some relevant references during discussion.	Data source has been provided now



SDI Review Form 1.5

relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	3. Section III is not linked with the discussion but with the technique (and the same happens with section IV). 4. Statistical analyses seem to be important, and they seem to be enough... but as I do not know nothing about the data used, their origin, and so on is difficult to follow the conclusions.	Modified accordingly
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	Not directly.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	The conclusion is more or less supported by the analysis, but they use too much space in the text to write about the techniques used and not enough about the problem analysed and the origin and explanations of the data used	Explanation of the econometrics technique is now modified. Data explanation is also given
References	Too many but they cite the basic ones... See comments on references in other sections of the review.	Corrected