



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT-12921
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF OIL PRICE VOLATILITY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	It is a must that the following corrections are made. 1- Any kind of repetitions should be avoided. 2-The author should not use too long sentences which only make the meaning of the sentences impossible to understand. 3-This is really important: There is a paragraph in the introduction that starts with "Some studies have shown that an increase in oil prices.... ". This part is shown with pink question marks. This part of the introduction that summarizes several studies on the issue should be explained in the Discussion part, not in the introduction. 4- Another problem was about the places of sentences. For instance; info about the four largest producers of oil is given in part 2. Since these producers are Nigeria, Algeria, Libya and Angola respectively, the details should follow this arrangement. Libya should be explained before Angola. 5- Another important point: In Part 3 which is the literature review, there were many sentences starting with for instance; [15] analyzed that.... or [7] examined that..... or According to [2]. This is a really wrong and terrible way of giving information in an academic article. The sentences should not start like these. If the author wants to give information about a previous study, he should use footnotes and give extra information about the author of previous	All the issues raised by the Reviewer's has been examined and appropriate correction has been made.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	studies in the footnotes at the bottom of the page.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are some grammar mistakes, such as subject-verb agreement problems or the use of adverbs in the wrong places in the sentence. There are also some mistakes when using some words, such as using “weather” where “whether” should be used and using “wind fall” where “windfall” should be used.	All these has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Red parts show the corrections. Blue parts show parts to be deleted and pink parts show the referee’s ideas.	All the blue parts have been deleted.