

I have carefully read the new version of the paper and, although some minor changes have been introduced.

As I have already said about the previous version, I think that the main problems are referred to the model specification, estimation and testing.

Regarding the definition of the considered variables, GDP is first defined as “the growth of real GDP per capita” (p. 5).

Since this variable is transformed with logarithms and differences, attention should be paid to the meaning of the variable $d(\ln \text{GDPP})$ as the growth of the initial variable (rate of growth of the rate of growth (or equivalently acceleration) of GDP). I changed to: **The growth of the initial GDP per capita, if you have a right words for this, please suggest or edit for me**

With regard to the stationarity analysis, there is a sentence according to which the non-stationarity results in “superior correlations” (page 5). This question should be revised (could it be a confusion between “superior” and “spurious”?), I corrected this mistake as **spurious correltaions**

Furthermore, once the ADF test are applied, the conclusion leads to a first difference of the series, but nevertheless this transformation is not included in expression (2) and at the end of page 6 the dependent variable is described as “the real growth of GDP per capita” ignoring the transformations (including the logarithms which appear in the equation). I updated

The estimation results summarized in table 3 include the dummy variable related to the ASEAN membership, even in model 2 which provides a negative (and non-significant) coefficient for this variable. I added few explanations

As I have already said in my previous report, the heteroskedasticity analysis is incorrect in two ways. According to the paper the null hypothesis is “that the error term is non-constant” and then concludes that when p values are high then heteroskedasticity exist.

First, the null hypothesis is homoskedasticity, which assumes that the variance of the errors are constant, and second the interpretation of the p-value, as usual, leads to the rejection of this hypothesis for low values of p. I have updated

Finally, regarding the English style, although the abstract has been significantly improved, the paper still has some grammatical mistakes. For instance:

”indicates” in table 2, page 6, should be plural (“indicate”) I have updated

“hypothesis” on page 8 is not a verb (should be “hypothesize” or “make an hypothesis”)

I have changed and updated

The expressions “level of significant” or “significant levels” should be revised (“significance”)

I have updated

Thank you very much for your useful comments and suggestions on my paper. I have updated some parts based on your last as well as all previous comments. I have learned a lot of things after working and following your suggestion. I think this would be a great experience that I would contribute for my next papers.