



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12601
Title of the Manuscript:	Macroeconomic Analyze in forecasting of States economic growth and International Labor Migration Dynamic
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	General comments: The article attempts to analyse relationship between the economic growth of countries and factors that drive or influence economic growth. The authors have done this at a macroeconomic level. Special focus has been given to the importance of three factors i.e. natural resources, human resources and financial resources. In consideration of this approach it can be said that the article is relevant to the journal. 1. However, for the article to be considered for publication much work need to be done to improve its flow of ideas, methodology and conclusion. In addition, authors should give attention to grammar, I have found it difficult to follow what authors are trying to say. The number of hypotheses listed should be revised as the article did not successfully tested all of them. 2. Authors should consider expanding introduction i.e. line 27 to 32. This should provide in depth information on the rationale behind the study. 3. Line 77 to 82 is not clear, authors must consider rephrasing these 4. Line 83 to 91 is too long and winding as a result it is difficult to follow it. Authors must consider breaking it into short focussed sentences. 5. Separate section on results should be provided. This will enhance the flow of ideas. 6. Authors has a tendency of starting sentences with the word "on the other hand (see sentences 245 to	Just want to express my deepest gratitude to dear reviewer for this evaluation! 1. Fully agreed! Abstract, introduction, methodology were corrected. Text revised one more time 2. Fully agreed! Introduction corrected! 3. Corrected 4. Corrected. Long sentencece was divided for 3. 5. New section – results – was made 6. Fully agreed – changed and corrected. 7. Fully agreed. Was corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	249-" or "furthermore (see sentences 204 and 2060". This indicates that there is a dire need to improve the grammar of the article. 7. It is very difficult to follow the logical reasoning in the conclusion. The section needs to be re-worked in line with the proposed improvements on introduction, methodology and results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Would like to express my deep gratitude to dear reviewer for reading my paper, its evaluation, for every comment and correction! Wish You all the bests!