

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_87661
Title of the Manuscript:	The nexus between Economic complexity and Foreign direct investment in Sub-Saharan Africa.
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:

(<https://www.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/editorial-policy>)

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract there is an acronym without explanation.</p> <p>The authors need to show in a clear way the goal of the paper in the introduction section.</p> <p>The aim's paper is only in the abstract.</p> <p>It is necessary to review the English Language in that article, especially paying attention to the use of plural verbs or single verbs.</p> <p>The complexity economy concept needs to be clear in the Literature Review, besides in the introduction.</p> <p>The authors mentioned a range of studies in the Literature Review, but it is necessary to explain a little more about the concepts about the foreign investment direct, complexity economic, their relations in the literature, especially to cite studies more recent.</p> <p>The methodology is a little confusing. That section is to show the procedures of the paper if other researchers would like to follow these same methods. My question is: Are these tables in the methodology section really the methodological procedures for constructing the research or are they part of the results?</p> <p>The final considerations are ok. I suggest the authors add the social implications of this paper.</p> <p>The authors need to review all the citations if they are in the References section. For example, is missing Lipsey and Zejan, (1994).</p> <p>In the References section there are different kinds of rules. For example, to reference two authors there are the use of & and "and" words.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amanda dos Santos Negreti
Department, University & Country	UNESP, Brazil