



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_18613
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND AUTOCRACY BASED ON SOCIAL INDICATORS
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	Lines 41-48 The text is very similar to the http://www3.nd.edu/~mcoppedg/crd/ch2.pdf - page 2, second paragraph. Line 64 "Anastasakasis" must be "Anastasakis". Line 95 "social and economic indicators" must be "social, demographic, and economic indicators". Line 97 "social and economic indicators" must be "social, demographic, and economic indicators". Line 139 "Data analysis program of excel is used to analyse the data" is a very poor way of expressing a statistical approach in a scientific paper. Lines 198-202 The conclusion should be more comprehensive and, above all, highlighting, using percentages, the major differences separate from the major similarities.	Lines 41-48 is the first paragraph of literature review with a reference. Therefore, similarity is expected. Some modification is done. Line 64, 95 and 97 has been modified. About line 139 comment, one can use Minitab, SPSS, SAS, etc., instead of excel but the results will be exactly same. Excel is a part of Microsoft which is commonly used and very easy to understand. Considering the expected reader of the paper it has been analysed and presented in a simple way. About lines 198-202, the conclusion has been modified substantially.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		