SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	**MS: 2013_BJEMT_3387**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Financial Intermediation and Economic Growth in Sudan: An Empirical investigation, 1970-2011.**

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:
(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	In general, I found the paper to be interesting and generally well-written. I thought that the econometric analysis was well executed (and described). I have a small number of comments that I think may improve the paper. When reading the paper I thought that the literature review could be reduced significantly. I don't think it is necessary to write a paragraph about each existing set of results. What I would suggest is to do the following: (i) Discuss all the theoretical arguments at one point rather than introducing the different theories when discussing a particular paper; (ii) Reduce the discussion on existing results, perhaps by talking about the general pattern of results from panel / cross-section studies at one point and the general pattern of results from time series studies at another; (iii) continue to include some discussion of studies on Africa, but again not discuss each paper separately. It may also be that the discussion on the state of the Sudanese economy and the discussion of financial conditions in Sudan could be reduced. My concern is that well over half of the paper is spent on the background, rather than the actual analysis undertaken in the paper. I think the paper needs to be answer the following: Given the small size of the financial sector in Sudan, why would we expect it to have a significant impact on growth in	I do the required.

	Sudan? Or in other words, why is Sudan an interesting example to look at? Terms like "Musharka" and "Salam contracts" are used in the paper, but I didn't notice any definitions of these terms. I think most readers would be unaware of these terms and I would suggest defining them explicitly. On page 18 it is stated that "Alternatively, we use the natural logarithm of real per capita GDP (LPGDP) as a measure of economic growth." Surely, only the first difference of this variable can be considered a measure of economic growth? In the discussion of the role of openness for growth on page 20 it may be worthwhile mentioning some key references on the relationship between openness and growth. As it stands the discussion of how openness affects growth is not clear. In Table 5 for example "*" indicates significance at the 1% level and "**" at the 5% level. It is more usual for more asterisks to indicate higher significance. It might be an idea to help people when reading the paper to also follow this convention. Including the asterisks in Table 7 (and Tables 8 and 9 for example) would also be useful. It would then not be necessary to report both the t-statistics and the p-values, which makes the table look a bit "busy".	What is the problem in using ln real per capita GDP as a measure of growth. By growth here we mean an increase in the level variable, which also implies an increase in its natural logarithm. There are many empirical studies that use real GDP or ln real per capita GDP, for example; Kargbo and Adamu (2009), Mehrara et al (2012), used real GDP as a measure of growth, Lee (2005) and Esso (2009) used real per capita GDP and Mahran (2012) and) used ln real per capita GDP as a measure of growth.

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		