



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10569
Title of the Manuscript:	The Relationship between Electricity Consumption and Economic Growth in Five Developing Countries
Type of the Article	Short 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	1. The references are not numbered in order of appearance, its format is not homogeneous, lacking journal titles, dates ... In the text, the authors haven't used the references numbers. 2. English expressions have some mistakes and are very poor. 3. The authors have used terms and acronyms that have not been defined in this paper (for example: α, H_0, GLS, D.V. n.d., LLC...) . 4. Tables have not been numbered or referenced. 5. The parameters calculated and expressed in the tables have not been defined (for example: I(0), I(1), Levin, Lin and Chu.....). 6. There are no individual data from the five countries studied. It can be very interesting to add these data as a table or graph. 7. The ** meaning is located in the wrong table.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The novelty is in the use of the Hausman method to study the relationship between electricity consumption and economic growth. The article needs a lot of changes to be understandable by the reader.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer