



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The author stated "From the existing45 literatures, a lot of studies have been done to examine the relationship between oil price and economic growth but46 only few studies have examined the relationship between oil price volatility on economic growth especially in sub- Saharan Africa". If there are already some studies on sub-Sahara Africa why then the need for this study? I think the author needs to provide a convincing reason for undertaking this study. The author failed to indicate his/her objective (s) for the study. I do not think the topic sentence can be synonymous with the objective (s). In the literature review the author simply stated the various authors of the extant studies and their methodologies without adequately making any critique. The author need to identify various gaps in the literature and provide a critique on them and situate his/her rationale in them. Generally, the theoretical literature on the impact of oil price volatility is categorized into two: the first looks at relationship between oil prices economic activities and direct effect of oil prices on aggregate output. The second analyses the direct and indirect effects arising from central bank policy responses to	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	the inflation caused by oil price increase. The author failed to include any of these theoretical categorizations in the work. This will be needed to provide a sound basis for the results obtained and the policy implications. The author failed to show panel unit root stationarity test either using Im et al, Pesaran et al or Breitung (2000). This is extremely important given the implication of non-stationary economic variables on the results of the study and policy effects. In the conclusion the author stated “It is therefore necessary for oil exporting countries to channel their oil wind fall to 366 various sectors of the economy so as to stimulate economic growth.” This is vague. The author needs to be more specific for effective policy recommendation. The policy recommendation implications of the finding are absent. This is important since the objective of every research work is to influence policy direction or provide confirmation of the effectiveness of policy direction.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are quite a lot of grammatical and typo errors. I therefore, suggest the article subjected to professional language editing.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Garden City University College, Ghana