



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_51193
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study on the Impact of Telecommunication Investment on Economic Growth in EU vis-à-vis non-EU OECD countries: A Dynamic Panel Data Analysis
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	<p>It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research. The authors must provide the software they have processed and the database they have accessed. I recommend the authors to present the novelty of this research compared to previous research. Authors must interpret the data in the tables:2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The authors must develop the conclusions according with the results from the table above mentioned. Authors should cite papers published in journals indexed in Web of Science.</p>	<p>We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her kind efforts. We appreciate the comments by the reviewer. Regarding the revisions:</p> <p>" It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research". <i>Purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the study have been added in the Introduction section.</i></p> <p>"The authors must provide the software they have processed and the database they have accessed" <i>Indeed, the software and the data resources are already indicated. I copy line 411 from the article as "Data retrieved from World Bank Development Indicators were analyzed by STATA 13.2."</i></p> <p>"I recommend the authors to present the novelty of this research compared to previous research." We underlined such novelties. For instance, we underlined that "Unlike many studies conducted in the literature, foreign direct investment's impact on growth in our paper is negative". Similarly, we spot where our findings differ from other(s) as, for instance, "The difference between our and Roller and Waverman [18] studies is that we used ..." or "Our research findings are significant in that it examines the relationship ..."</p> <p>" Authors must interpret the data in the tables:2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The authors must develop the conclusions according with the results from the table above mentioned." Mentioned Tables have been interpreted. A conclusion has been developed from the Tables, and added into the manuscript.</p> <p>"Authors should cite papers published in journals indexed in Web of Science" Indeed, we do. The following journals we cited appear in the Web of Science, for instance: Review of International Economics Kyklos Transnational Corporations Review Journal of Regulatory Economics Economic Modelling The Quarterly Journal of Economics Telecommunications Policy</p>
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	