



SDI Review Form 1.6

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
Date received	January 31, 2020
Date due	February 04, 2020

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	<p>In general, a good and attractive subject and appropriately written paper.</p> <p>The authors were clear in their research plan.</p> <p>The abstract is clear and provides clear introduction to the parts of the paper</p> <p>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]</p> <p>The literature is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself to the methodology and later on to the discussions.</p> <p>The methodology is appropriate and clear</p> <p>The results are clear, well presented appropriate to support the discussion about the objectives of the paper.</p> <p>The discussion is adequate and does support the objectives declared through the paper. Conclusion and recommendations are adequate,</p> <p>Proofreading is needed and immediate action on references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes, because of the missed citations in the reference list, when added this is solved... Unethical use of Inflation of references</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Hussin Jose Hejase</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Al Maaref University, Lebanon</i>