Review of: "Contribution of Indirect Taxes on Goods to Economic Growth of Pakistan (1972-2022)"

Miroslav Gombar[1]

1 University of Presov

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The presented study, entitled: Contribution of Indirect Taxes on Goods to Economic Growth of Pakistan (1972-2022), sets itself the primary goal of identifying the empirical relationship between indirect taxes (federal sales tax, federal excise tax, customs duty) and the economic growth of Pakistan. To solve the primary goal, the authors chose time series analysis (1972 to 2018), which is an attempt to demonstrate long-term and short-term relationships between indirect taxes and economic growth. The authors use classic time series analysis tools: unit root tests, cointegration tests, and the Vector Error Correction model.

The presented study sets an ambitious goal, which the authors try to fulfill using the analytical tools of time series analysis. However, it should be noted that a large number of other variables also influence economic growth, and thus the results of the study are somewhat distorted (I will comment on this in the conclusion). I will now make a few comments on the presented study. Of course, I don't want to criticize the authors, but I will be happy if the authors take this as a reminder to improve their study:

1. Introduction and Literature Review would be appropriate to link into one unit. Only in the introduction itself do the authors refer to literary sources, and therefore the literary research would be a natural continuation of the introduction without unnecessary division. The second reminder is the structure of the Literature Review. A simple definition of what the authors researched and what they came up with without mutual connection and justification of the results for the study itself does not give me logic. In its current form, the literary research must be revised. At the end of the literature review, the main goal of the study is only repeated. I miss the authors' own contribution here (that is, apart from the time series analysis). Here the authors should answer the questions: what new did their study bring? Does the study address a research gap? (based on literature research), What is the authors' own contribution to the development of the researched issue compared to other authors. These questions, too, I expect to be answered.

2. Methodology – I rate the graphic representation of the solution procedure as very positive, but on the other hand, for the completely unnecessary description of generally known data analysis procedures (Normality Testing of Data, Correlation, Stationary Property of Data, Optimal Lag, Cointegration Testing, Vector Error Correction Model). I recommend writing these analyses simply, for what they are used for, not dedicating too much space to them. If the reader does not understand the basic relationships, he can find them in the literature dealing with time series.

3. Results and Discussion: This chapter contains the basic results of the time series analysis. I find their description

problematic. The description of the individual tables is very simplified and has only a descriptive character. I miss drawing adequate conclusions, i.e., answers to the questions: Why is this so? What do the given results represent in a wider context? At the same time, there is no discussion, even though the authors promise a discussion in the title. The discussion should represent a critical evaluation of the obtained results in comparison with other scientific studies, with the drawing of broader conclusions. This part must be completely revised and supplemented.

4. Conclusion – the conclusion is too simplified without conveying value. No recommendations or practical implications are made based on the analysis. At the same time, in the conclusion, I miss defining the limitations of the research (research limits) and the direction of further research.

I will repeat the previous statement. I do not want the authors of the study to perceive my review as criticism, but as a guide to improving the study. **In its current form, I do not recommend publishing the study, and at the same time, if the authors decide to "remake" their study, I would be happy if it could be reviewed in the second round.** The idea and goal of the study are interesting, but it is necessary to get the study into a scientific form.