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.**
Type of article:	**Research paper**

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 paper is without motivation. The author has failed to put up a cogent reason(s) why the paper should be read. What knowledge gap is the paper filling? 2. How different is the author's work from the previous works in Sudan? 3. The author should consider rewriting the literature review. He should summarise the main findings of each work. There is too much over-elaboration. Since the study is in Africa he should concentrate more on studies that have been done in Africa. Works like: i. Adusei, M. (2012) Financial Development and Economic Growth: Is Schumpeter Right? *British Journal of Economics, Management and Trade*, 2(3),pp. 265-278 ii. Adusei, M. (2013) Financial Development and Economic Growth: Evidence from Ghana, *The International Journal of Business and Finance Research, 7(5), pp.61-76* iii. Ndako, U.B. (2010) Financial Development and Economic Growth: Evidence from Nigeria. *The IUP Journal of Financial Economics*, 8(4), 37-59.	

	iv. Odhiambo N.M. (2008), Financial Depth, Savings and Economic Growth in Kenya: A Dynamic Casual Relationship, *Economic Model* , 25(4), 704–713. v. Odhiambo, N.M. (2010), Finance-Investment-Growth Nexus in South Africa: An ARDL-bounds Testing Procedure, Econ Change Restruct, 43, 205–219 4. Author should discuss his results in relation to previous studies. What is the paper's contribution to knowledge? 5. Author should consider revising the whole work. The work is too long.	

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	The author should check his English Language. The grammar needs fine-tuning. He seems to be mixing past tense with present tense. He can choose to either write the paper in the present tense or in the past tense	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Michael Adusei**
Department, University & Country	**KNUST School of Business, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, PMB, University Post Office, Kumasi,Ghana.**