



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_17085
Title of the Manuscript:	NATIONS AND GLOBAL ECONOMIC COMPETITION: The Influence of Conflict and Politics
Type of the 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	• Diagram 1. Improve the notes of this figure. The authors could report properly the data sources. They may explain better the data used for this figure. For example, mention time periods of data and the countries involved. • Table 1. What do the pairs of numbers indicate in this table? Please, explain better the table in the manuscript. I have the same comment for Table 2. • The authors may change the numbering of tables. Currently, it is: 1, 2.A, 1.B, 2.B. Sometimes this numbers do not coincide with the way they are mentioned in the manuscript (e.g. Table 2 for 2.A; Table 1 for 1.B; Table 2 for 2.B). Why not to use 1, 2, 3 and 4? • Tables 1.B and 2.B. Numbers are very small in these tables. The authors may reorganise the structure of these tables the make them more readable and nicer. • The authors show Table 1.B in order to comment on slow growth rates of European Union countries for period 2007 to 2013. Then, the table shows data from 2000 to 2013. The authors may correct this. Furthermore, the table presents log GDP per capita. I am not sure why they take the log of GDP per capita. From the point of view of interpretation of the values presented in the table, I am not sure whether this is a good choice. Alternatively, the authors could show the percentage change of GDP per capita between 2007 and 2013. This way, the table would be smaller	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and would fit into one page better. Is nominal or real GDP presented in Table 1.B? • Abbreviations are never introduced when they first appear in the manuscript. Please, correct this. • The authors use decimal coma instead of decimal point. For example, see Tables 1.B and 2.B. Please, correct this.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• Line 617. Maybe “choc” is “shock”.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	• The manuscript is a nice review of economic thinking about competition, covering the views of different schools of economic thinking.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Szabolcs Blazsek
Department, University & Country	School of Business, Universidad Francisco Marroquin, Guatemala