



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_18378
Title of the Manuscript:	Modelling Automotive Energy Demand in Ghana: The policy Implication on Ghanaian Economy.
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The author needs to describe the principle and differences of several methods in the third part of this paper (3.0 research methodology). 2. The second part content of this paper (2.0 literature review) is too simple. There are many of papers on the prediction of energy demand. Therefore, other research results about this topic that have published should be supplemented.	The concerns addressed . This is paper and to the best of our knowledge the papers reviewed should be enough for the paper but that notwithstanding some additions has been done to the methodology.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The opinion is inaccurate, which is in the sentence of "Possible reasons that may account for this observation is the growing emergence of private and passenger vehicles that use gasoline instead of premium" in the line 177-179. The author may consider using the specific statistic data to explain the research result. 2. Fig 4.5 is lack of the name of the coordinate. 3. The unit of measurement is absent in the Table 4.3 4. There are many minor problems in this paper. The author needs to modify.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		