SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
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)*
Compulsory 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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Victor Manuel Monteiro Seco**
Department, University & Country	**University of Lisbon, Portugal**