



SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>1. It is poorly written in terms of the language of communication. The tenses are poorly articulated and written in futuristic form when the work is already completed.</p> <p>2. The paper is weak in methodology. The chosen VAR was not properly deployed and the results very definitely spurious, unreliable and invalid to say the least.</p> <p>3. Drawn conclusions are counter-intuitive and anti-theoretical making them spurious.</p> <p>4. I recommend that the paper be sent back to the author with the reviewers' comments which are just well made as well as the editorial comments.</p>	<p>The language has been checked by native speaker</p> <p>-The methodology (VAR) s clearly appropriate method, since we do not restrict data in order to fit any structural model. The analysis address the statistical causal relationship between GDP and infrastructure investment. The source of data WB and Saudi Arabia Monetary Agency and World Bank</p>