

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

Rafiq Ahmed¹

¹ University of Karachi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Comments to the manuscript entitled: Contribution of Indirect Taxes on Goods to Economic Growth of Pakistan (1972-2022)

Note to Editor

Dear Editor

This manuscript does not qualify for publication because the author has made major mistakes in model selection, errors in estimation like the presence of correlation among variables. They did not give motivation for conducting such a research as there are already studies available on the topic. I reject this manuscript.

Comments:

1. Manuscript is without page numbers and line numbers.
2. References are not in alphabetical order
3. "(M/S Elahi Cotton Mills vs. Federation of Pakistan 1997)" what does it imply? Is it a reference, or something else?
4. The starting two sentences do not clearly define the topic. Modify them into a general statement which clearly define the topic along with reference.
5. "(Revenue statistics 2017, OECD)" What is it? a reference or footnote?
6. Introduction section is neither clear nor comprehensive, it does not qualify for a scholarly writing. Instead it contains court orders about tax definitions, if they are necessary then their essence should be given so as a lay man can understand.
7. "OECD 2008b" is not in references and it is widely used in the introduction and literature review section.
8. Include a theoretical review on the topic selected in the literature review section.
9. The author has derived variables from OECD report and it does not follow a standard model. This is completely rejected. How a variable list is estimated from a published report?
10. The literature review section discuss model for estimation rather than discussion about the impact of indirect taxes on the economic growth. Model discussion should be given in the methodological section.
11. A table is supplied without title, table no and its sources. Supply all the details.
12. In study "Shahzad Ahmed et al 2016" what does ratio of 1:1.25 imply? What does it tell us? Also in another study "Shahzad Ahmed et al 2018" what does the ratio of 1:1.68 tell us and what is its significance?

13. The order is missing in the literature review; what order do you have follow? Year of publication, topic-wise, related to Pakistan, related to regional studies or international studies? You should follow an order.
14. The literature is given as it is however, a critical review is required for a research paper. Conclude the literature review that what did you infer from the presented studies and what is your motivation to conduct this research study?
15. The methodological section contains without numbered figure! Supply figure no.
16. The paragraph starts with "To empirically analyse the relationship..." This paragraph says that equation 2 is differentiated and hypothesized as equation 3. What is the meaning of the differentiated and hypothesized? The equation 3 does not contain any differentials. Justify.
17. What is the justification of using GDP at market prices? GDP at constant prices reflect much more clear additions to the income of the country, whereas market prices does include inflationary effect. How will you address this issue?
18. In normality testing of data section reference of Jarque and Bera (1980, 1987), this contains two years. It is wrong. If both authors have published their work in theses two years then you should cite them separately.
19. In correlation section author has mentioned the guideline whether to accept or reject a hypothesis on the basis of t test, its written in books. Why don't authors discuss about their results?
20. Again figure ST, FE, and CD ... does not have figure number and the source is author. What does it mean? Does author has estimated or constructed, that should be clearly mentioned. This figure is part of the description of the trend of the variables and it should be kept in the introduction section. The result section clearly state about the estimated results.
21. When author has used Custom Act of 1969, he/she should give the details of the document that contains its details in the footnote, otherwise it will be dubious.
22. The correlation shows that all variables are highly correlated then the estimated results are not valid. The author should transform the variables or similar treatment to them.
23. The ADF table does not report the calculated tau test results for first difference in the same table. They should be reported in the same table so that difference between level and first difference estimated values can be seen.
24. Some values are highlighted in the yellow colour, is it shows some distinction? Why author does not give table number, title?
25. Where are the max eigen test and trace test results? Give its values with critical values.
26. The table entitled: Results of VECM with Adjusted Sample of 1980-2022, whereas the stated sample of the study is 1972 to 2018! It is stated in the abstract. Why is the difference in the sample?
27. The conclusion section tells us about estimation results of the cointegration! What does it mean conclusion from the current research, where are policy guidelines and direction for further research?