SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJEMT_3739**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Determinants of Resource-seeking Foreign Direct Investment: Co-integration and Causality Analysis for Saudi Arabia**

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 7 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	**1. The contribution of this research to the literature must be made clear. How is it different from previous research which find similar results? From the literature review, it sounds very similar to Abdel-Rahman (2002) and others. At this point, it is not clear to the reader that this research is original. Lines 300 – 321 suggest it is not. I encourage the authors to clearly demonstrate the contribution.** **2. More time must be devoted to the data. Surprisingly, more detail can be found in the abstract than the text. Sources, time periods, countries involved, etc. Table A is a good idea but, unfortunately, it is insufficient. Please elaborate on the data used.** **3. Playing off that last point, is the data aggregate fdi flows into KSA? If so, it might be interesting to look at industry level fdi flows (though I'm not sure that this data is available). An investigation of the different fdi flows across industries (which is mentioned in the paper) might be informative and add nicely to this paper (or another).** **4. In my opinion, too much effort is devoted to the test for co-integration. Lines 240 – 285**	1. The issue has been addressed. 2. The issue has been addressed. 3. This can be an agenda for future research. 4. In our opinion, appropriate effort has been devoted to co-integration. Even, in some papers, more effort has been made to

	can be simplified to 'To address potential co-integration, we first-difference the data.' Include Table 2 in the appendix to justify the decision, if you like. I believe Table 3 is unnecessary. **5. The writing must be addressed. Numerous instances of typographical errors and awkward writing (too many to list).**	describe the methodology. This section is, in fact, back bone of the analysis done in the study. If we simplify the lines 240-285, methodology section will be very much small. Generally, we have to describe the methodology in one or two pages. The same has been done in the paper. Table 2 has been included in appendix but table 3 is necessary because whole analysis is based on the results of table 3. It tells about the existence of the long-run relationship. 5. The issue has been addressed.
Minor REVISION comments	• **Line 205 - A definition of fiscal balance (similar to that provided for trade openness on line 189) would be helpful to the reader.** • **I don't believe the facts put forth in lines 87-90 support the statement in lines 85-87.**	• Fiscal balance has been defined. • The issue has been addressed.
Optional/General comments	• **An interesting paper that I enjoyed reading. However, the contribution must be made clear. How is this research different? Is it the technique? The data sources?** • **The literature review may benefit from some form of aggregation. Perhaps a table to concisely present the various papers, the data used, the technique applied and the findings. This may aid in demonstrating where this research fits in and adds to the literature.**	• Contribution part has been made clear while data sources have been elaborated further. • Literature review has been modified to appear as more appropriate. Since this comment is optional, we would take the liberty of not inserting the table.