

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JEMT_117891
Title of the Manuscript:	Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Analysis of the Relationship Between Public Health Expenditure and Economic Growth in Benin
Type of the Article	

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- The manuscript is very important of the scientific community. It reveals the different case for the Benin which is important to every one know about.</p> <p>2- Title is correct and comprehensive. But for the author it may be little change it may be like this because its only on one country not the panel so if author want to change the title it may be as follows</p> <p>i. Unlocking Benin's Growth Potential: A Time-Lagged Analysis of Public Health Spending and Economic Performance</p> <p>ii. Optimizing Health Investments: A Time Series Analysis of Public Health Expenditure and Economic Growth in Benin</p> <p>3- The abstract is good for the article but needs little correction in first line of introduction of the study than its objectives and other related discussion.</p> <p>4- Yes subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5- Yes the manuscript is scientifically correct after the correction.</p> <p>6- References are not sufficient and just 4 references are recent. Author should add more recent references if available. Further more references are not according to the guideline of the journal</p> <p>Suggestion: Author should add more articles in empirical review section which is not sufficient for the current study as it is on public health and economic growth there are a lot of studies related to economic growth it should be addressed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The language quality of the article is good and suitable for the scholarly communications	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Over all the manuscript is good but need some changes	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muhammad Aurmaghan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Economics, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan</b>