Paper: **"Chinese FDI Influence in the Capital Generation, Trade, and Inflation with the Perspective of Economic Development in Pakistan"**

Corresponding Author: Matiha Riaz

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valentin Marian Antohi
University Dunarea de Jos of Galati, Romania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ *Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020*

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Valentin Antohi	
University/Country: Dunarea de Jos University of Galati/Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 08.07.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 14.07.2020
Manuscript Title: **Chinese FDI and Economic Development: A case study of Pakistan**	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0753/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**5**
The title is appropriate with the study.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**5**
The research method and the objectives are presented in the abstract. The results presented in the abstract are correlated to the conclusions.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling	**5**

mistakes in this article.	
The article is generally well written. As I am not a native English speaker, I am unable to correct the grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**5**
The methodology is well written and argued.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	**4**
Presenting the body of the paper, in accordance with the introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) structure. The objectives are presented from the introduction, work hypotheses are not presented or demonstrated in the results chapter.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**4**
The conclusion part does not specify the limitations of the study.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**5**
The bibliographical sources are adequate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation)：

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	**x**
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: