



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12156
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Customs Regulation in the Efficiency on International Trade
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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 main idea of the paper is interesting and obviously fairly novel subject to the international trade affected by customs regulation. However, the text is written poorly and unclearly as to the computational implementation and techniques. The English of the text is also very poor. There are some sentences being not understandable or lacking verbs. The paper would require extensive corrections to reach an acceptable level. What is 'de CRS' mentioned in the abstract and later. Define all special terms. Not all readers could know them. At the end of the abstract, there is a remaining text part of 'information for authors': 'The abstract should be concise ... , at first use'. Remove this. Section 2, line 84: Define FDH model briefly with a sentence and express the name fully, not merely as an abbreviation. Line 85: Poland is within the EU. Correct. Section 3: The text of this section should be written more clearly, precisely and extensively to give a reader a sensible description how the models were implemented and how they were used for computation. Lines 157-164: Do not start with a subordinate sentence, i.e., write 'where' with the small initial 'w' instead of 'W', because this is a part of the preceding "text" that is to say the formulae of lines 151-155.	All adjustments identified by the review have been corrected and marked in yellow in the text



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Lines 161-164: The texts such as 'Amount ... DMU' are written strangely putting the texts and superscripts wrong: texts as subscripts and superscripts as texts (as to the vertical direction). Instead, write the text as usual in its own line and then use i, j and k either as superscripts or subscripts. Line 170: Define θ_k. Lines 176-179: The text here is very unclear and grammatically wrong. The meaning of Figure 1 is fully unclear. How were its broken lines calculated, with what data, what were its coefficients (associated with the formulae of Lines 152-155), and what does the figure tell a reader? The differences can be seen between the two broken lines, but so what. What does this mean? Do models always behave like this or does their behaviour depend on the data and coefficients produced by such data? Note also that it is not enough to give the source of the figure, but also the permission of the copyright owner of the figure is required. The new abbreviations used in Table 1 were not explained. Explain GTE, PTE and SE. How rank was determined? This is easy to guess, but it is, however, reasonable to define. The following table is Table 3. Where is Table 2? Correct the numbers of the tables. In Table 3 there are unclear concepts as column labels: L-Peer Customs number{1} etc. What does L-Peer mean? Define also the meanings of 1 and 0 here. Throughout the text there are frequent unclear sentences,	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	misspellings and grammatically wrong text parts. To mention some: Line 98: This is unclear. The meaning cannot be understood. Line 200: use → uses Line 281: follow → followed Line 288: Should → It should Line 290-291: The sentence 'As it ... houses' lacks a verb. Lines 293-295: mayor → major it the case → it is the case brazil → Brazil Line 319: can → it can Line 331: number of costumes → costs are [perhaps?] Line 335: observed → observe Line 337: want → wants The English of the entire paper should be corrected by a native English proofreader or linguist.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		