



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15651
Title of the Manuscript:	Foreign direct investment and accumulation of the technological capital in developing countries: interdependence and causality the case of Tunisia
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	1) The introduction talks from the economic side without addressing the importance of FDI from the perspective of Tunisia economic growth. Furthermore, the conclusion of the first paragraph is not properly written. 2) The abstract need to be rewrite as more than one test have been conducted by using the OLS method. Readers will get conflict as more test describe in the analysis part. 3) In the conclusion part, at the first glance, author should stress out the originality and the beauty of the findings and then compared with literature review, but not in the vice versa.	1. A paragraph talking about the importance of FDI to the Tunisia economic growth was added to the introduction. 2. The conclusion of the first paragraph was rephrased. 3. The abstract is rewritten. 4. In the conclusion, we present the originality and the quality of findings and in the next step we compared there with the literature review
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Please refer the proper way to cite other papers as there are lack of consistency in typing the references. 2) Some words need to rephrase as below: -Secondly, the values of t-statistics and p-value (0.189 and 0.851) say that ... * Secondly, the t values of 0.189 and p values of 0.851 respectively indicated that the ... -FDI as a good accelerator of the catching up process. What type of process you are referring? (refer pp: 88) 3) Wrong numbering -4.1.1.1 Stationary study of series -4.1.1.1 Cointegration Test	We agree with all the comments and we have revised the article as is already requested by reviewer All these words were rephrased as it is announced by reviewer. We speak about the economic catching –up named also in some cases the economic convergence. 4.1.1.2 Cointegration Test
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The topic is interesting and only have small correction.	