



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 is poorly written. The presentation of the methods has a number of errors, the results are not discussed sufficiently. The paper does not contribute to the literature.	Errors have been corrected now and results are also discussed in detailed
Specific comments:	See the comments below.	
Title and abstract	Title should include "employment" term. The abstract is appropriate.	Not Agree ; Employment used in the paper just as a control variable. Other reviewers complement the title
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The objective is not original. The model specification is not justified. The literature review is not well-structured.	We have further elaborated on the objective of the study. Number of other studies used same specification for other countries, like Ozturk and Acaavci, (2010)
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The references are not adequate: the study does not provide an EKC analysis but the literature review focuses on the EKC literature. The previous literature is not reviewed accurately to provide information about the existing results for the case of Saudi Arabia.	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)	The methods are now quite standard in this literature. However, it seems that they are not properly applied in this paper (see below).	Methodological flaws are corrected
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?)	The data are not presented. The sources of the data are not known. The variable definitions are not clear. For instance, what are employment ratio (LAP) and "per capita" employment ratio (LAP/N)? Econometric analysis is necessary to conduct the study. However, the analysis contains some conceptual and methodological flaws: in the ARDL framework, test hypothesis of a long-run relationship is not correct; unit root equations are not correct; the ECM term should be one lagged; from the results of a unit root one cannot conclude that "the results of the test indicate that we can reject the null hypothesis of no cointegration vectors", a process integrated of order i is indicated by I(i), not 1(i). These flaws cast doubts on the results presented in the paper.	Now data source has been mentioned in the study. Employment ratio (LAP) is total labour force ratio to total population. It is corrected in the manuscript. All methodological flaws including test hypothesis for long-run relationship, unit root equation and ECM, mentioned here are corrected now.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data,	There are some inconsistencies between what are reported in tables	It is corrected now



SDI Review Form 1.5

discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	and what is mentioned in the text. For instance, "estimated coefficients of energy consumption are positive and significant by 0.34 percent" , in fact from Table 3, it is 41 percent". The study findings are not discussed rigorously, it is only indicated what the Granger causality tests suggest.	
References	Energy-economic growth nexus has already been investigated for the case of Saudi Arabia in a number of papers. None of them has been cited.	Corrected