Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_54625**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Strategic Thinking in Resource Diversification: Assessing the Value of Nuclear Energy in Turkey**
Type of the Article	**Policy 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	In general, a good and attractive subject and appropriately written paper. The authors were clear in their research plan. The abstract is clear and provides clear introduction to the parts of the paper The Introduction and the literature review are good and streamlined. However, citations are not adequately reported so as to represent the subject matter. There are all important citations which are not reported in the list of references. These must be added to avoid unethical use of inflation of references. In addition almost all the references in your list are not reported adequately to match the citations… Therefore changes were suggested and reorganized [see corrected manuscript attached] The literature is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself to the methodology and later on to the discussions. The methodology is appropriate and clear The results are clear, well presented appropriate to support the discussion about the objectives of the paper. The discussion is adequate and does support the objectives declared through the paper. Conclusion and recommendations are adequate, Proofreading is needed and immediate action on references: **1. Referencing needs careful review of write up consistency** **2. Must add missing citations in the list of references** **3. Either remove extra references from the list marked in RED or add to the text.**	Dear Sir/Madam, I carefully looked at your suggestions and markings. 1 -The referencing was done according to APA style. In the text body the last name appears. In the reference section Name and the first letter of the authors last name listed. Therefore I would like to point out that all the citations in the text are referenced. All references are cited in the text. Ex: Page 2: (Yaprakli, 2013, p.17). Sevda, Y. ..which is Sevda Yaprakli. In reference it appears as: Sevda, Y. (2013) Enerjiye Dayali Büyüme, Istanbul, Beta Yayinlari. Turkish. I double checked all your highlights. 2- Page 10: I have added extra references to support the information I used. 3-Spelling and formatting errors are fixed. Appreciate your effort and detailed markings. That was very helpful. Thank you for your comments and contributions.
Optional/General comments	**Copy of corrected paper is attached**	

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)* Yes, because of the missed citations in the reference list, when added this is solved… Unethical use of Inflation of references	