SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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:	The paper assesses the existence of an environmental Kuznets curve for the Saudi Arabian economy. Methodology used (time series econometrics) and results (economic growth and co2 emissions are linearly and positively correlated) are now well-known. Interest of the paper relies on the data. Basically, it is not easy to find environmental data for Saudi Arabia which is one of the most polluting countries in the world.	Source of environmental data for Saudi Arabia is given in the study
Specific comments:	Check typos.	Manuscript has been edited for typo error
Title and abstract	Title is good but the abstract is too long and technical.	Abstract is modified
Introduction *(Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)*	The objective of this study is not original, but the data are interesting. It could be helpful to compare the results obtained in the paper with articles that have studied EKC issues for other countries producing oil, like South American countries.	we could not find the such studies from other oil producing countries.
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Yes, references cited are relevant and significant	
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)*	Methodology is deeply detailed, description is even too long	It is modified
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide 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?)	No information on the data. The authors should provide figures describing the evolution of the main variables, like economic growth, energy consumption…	Data sources has been provided now
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	
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)	No particular comment, conclusion is very close to the abstract	
References	No comment	