



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	• 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. • 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. • 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). • In my opinion, too much effort is devoted to the test for co-integration. Lines 240 – 285 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.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The writing must be addressed. Numerous instances of typographical errors and awkward writing (too many to list).	
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.	
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.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer