

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Business, Management and Economics: Research Progress
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2455
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF UGANDA'S FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT INFLOWS IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1987 AND 2018
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive analysis of the determinants of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows in Uganda, a topic of great relevance for developing economies seeking to attract foreign capital. The use of advanced econometric techniques, such as Granger causality tests and the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM), enhances the robustness of the findings, offering valuable insights into the complex interrelationships among electricity consumption, domestic investment, GDP growth, and trade liberalization. I appreciate the manuscript's emphasis on the critical role of electricity supply in driving FDI, particularly in the manufacturing sector, which is often overlooked in similar studies. Overall, the research contributes to the understanding of FDI dynamics in Uganda and provides actionable recommendations for policymakers, making it a valuable addition to the literature on economic development and investment strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The more comprehensive title in my opinion is "Key Drivers of Foreign Direct Investment in Uganda: The Impact of Electricity Consumption and Domestic Investment"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract of the article is comprehensive, it should ideally include the following elements: the research objective, methodology, key findings, and implications and the current abstract have all the above mentioned elements.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate. The manuscript is organized into clear sections, including an introduction, methodology, results, and discussion, which facilitates a logical flow of information. The methodology section is particularly detailed, outlining the data types, sources, and estimation techniques used, such as the stationarity test and cointegration test, which are essential for understanding the analytical framework of the study. This structured approach allows readers to easily follow the research process and comprehend the findings.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous application of advanced econometric techniques, including the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) and Granger causality tests, which are appropriate for analyzing the relationships among the variables of interest. The use of these methods allows for a comprehensive examination of both short-run and long-run dynamics, ensuring that the findings are well-supported by the data. Additionally, the manuscript includes thorough statistical tests, such as the Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test for stationarity, which enhances the credibility of the results by confirming the validity of the time series data used in the analysis. Overall, the methodological rigor and attention to detail in the analysis contribute to the scientific correctness of the manuscript, making it a valuable contribution to the literature	

Review Form 2

	on Foreign Direct Investment in Uganda.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references in the manuscript appear to be a mix of both recent and older studies, which is important for providing a comprehensive background. It would be beneficial to include more recent studies, particularly those published in the last five years, that focus on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) dynamics, electricity consumption, and economic growth in developing countries. Additionally, I suggest including references that specifically address the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on FDI, as this is a significant recent event that may have influenced investment trends. Some potential references could include: UNCTAD (2021). "World Investment Report 2021: Investing in Sustainable Recovery." OECD (2020). "FDI in Figures: COVID-19 Impact on FDI." Any recent articles from journals such as the Journal of Economic Development or World Development that discuss FDI trends post-2020. Incorporating these references would strengthen the manuscript's foundation and provide a more current perspective on the topic.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript presents a thorough analysis of the determinants of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows in Uganda, but it would benefit from minor revisions to enhance clarity and depth. Specifically, the authors should consider elaborating on the implications of their findings for policymakers, particularly regarding the critical role of electricity consumption in attracting FDI. Additionally, providing a more detailed discussion on the limitations of the study and potential areas for future research would strengthen the manuscript's contribution to the literature. The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it employs a formal tone and appropriate academic vocabulary. However, there are instances where clarity could be improved, such as in the explanation of complex econometric methods and results. Ensuring that technical terms are well-defined and that sentences are concise would enhance readability and comprehension for a broader audience	
Optional/General comments	Conclusion and recommendation section could be more comprehensive. Currently, it may not fully encapsulate the significance of the findings or provide actionable insights for policymakers. To improve this section, the authors should consider summarizing the key findings more explicitly and discussing their implications in greater detail. Additionally, offering specific recommendations based on the results—such as strategies for enhancing electricity supply or attracting more FDI—would provide practical guidance for stakeholders. Including a discussion on potential future research directions could also enrich this section, highlighting areas that require further exploration.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 2](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Ali
Department, University & Country	Al-Madinah International University, Malaysia