

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

Maham Furqan¹

¹ Oregon State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is really well-organized and provides sufficient information for replicability for the most part. Similar to what my colleagues have shared, I would start by saying that in the literature review, it's a little difficult to tell how and why this current paper is crucial for the literature pool. The discussion of previous studies also feels a little more like an annotated bibliography than a literature review. I would, therefore, suggest the researchers to divide the studies by themes and ideas and maybe even create sub-headings if that helps. Additionally, these studies should not only be related due to the topic but the methodologies these researchers, why they used them, what makes these papers different than this current paper would be helpful in carving out an argument that this paper is adding value to the literature.

In the methodology, more arguments around why this method was used, why this specific time period and sample were used, and why other methods used by other researchers are not providing a clear picture would help. Checking the normality and stationarity makes sense and there is probably no need to explain that further. However, other data analysis methods need to be justified.

The conclusion is way too brief and does not do justice to all the hard work above. I highly recommend flushing out this section and expanding on the policy implications. Right now, it does nothing more than just summarizing the results which is less than sufficient. The Contribution/Implications in the beginning of the paper are also really brief and do not help understand the practical side of things. Also, what about theoretical implications? Shedding some light on that would be a good idea. I would also suggest discussing study limitations and how other researchers could think about this topic when they conduct a similar study.

Overall, I think it's a good econometric attempt but theoretically, the paper could be improved to make the analysis more robust. There is barely any argumentation going on in the paper which negatively affects its credibility and scholarly weight.