SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
Manuscript Number:	**2014_BJEMT_10160**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ECONOMIC STRUCTURE'S CHANGE BASED ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DOMESTIC FINAL DEMAND AND PRODUCTION,VALUE ADDED AND IMPORT**
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	In my opinion, this paper must rewrite because of several reasons. i. It is really difficult to understand the paper because it needs professional editing by a native speaker. ii. Related to (i), it is also difficult to follow what the aim of and the contribution of the paper are. iii. This paper was not written in a typical manuscript format. For example, why the author(s) showed a table in the Introduction section. (Related to this, it is not clear why the author(s) aggregated the I/O tables to 15 sectors, even if they mentioned that to support the research's purpose (see line 48). The author(s) should discuss the I/O tables in a Data section and they should give more detail about the two I/O tables. For example, I wanted to see the technology matrix calculated from these tables. The author(s) used 2000 prices. Is it a base year of national accounts of Vietnam General Statistics Office? I would prefer to convert all data to a base year which is selected by Vietnam General Statistics Office. The comparison will still be biased because the average inflation rate increased from 5% to 13% from 2000 to 2010. **iv.** They have not had a proper literature review. This makes the manuscript weak because the reader will want to see why this paper is different than the others on this economy. They, at least, must have mentioned about the papers on Vietnamese economy and what specifically happened during 2000-2010	

	period. It is not clear in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/Generalcomments	It is clear that input-output analysis should be of great using in production planning. Thus, the results obtained from input-output analysis are important for the Vietnamese economy. However, the author(s) should have discussed which assumptions followed to simplify the problem of the manuscript.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer