



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: **“Industry vs. Services: Long- and Short-Run Growth Effects of FDI in Türkiye”**

Submitted: 01 January 2026

Accepted: 15 February 2026

Published: 31 March 2026

Corresponding Author: Derya Hekim

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n7p112

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Albin Klosinski
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Reviewer 2: Katerina Tosevska
Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, North Macedonia

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Clear, but: Industry vs. services: long - and short - run growth effects of FDI in Turkiye

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Clearly presents

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

No: page 9, ARDL growth equation - You should adapt the record to the dimensions of the side;

ARDL model - You should adapt the record to the dimensions of the side.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

It is accurate and supported

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It is comprehensive and appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Page 3, the title, Figure 1. Inward sectoral FDI (billion USD);
page 4, the title of the point, Literature review;
page 6, the title, Table 1. Empirical literature related to Turkiye;
page 7, the title of the point, Empirical model and methodology;
page 10, the title, Table 2. Unit root test results;
page 11, the title, Table 3. Bounds test results;
the title, Table 4. Estimated long and short run results;
page 16, the title of the point, Conclusions and policy implications;
page 21, the title, Figure A1. Cusum and cusum square test results. Industry;
the title, Figure A2. Cusum and cusum square test results. Services.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and adequate for the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

In general the Abstract is fine and presents the objectives, methods, results and conclusion. But I have one remark: it says that in long-run industry-related FDI exerts a weakly negative or insignificant effect while as I can see in the results the effect is negative but significant.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

I haven't found grammatical and spelling mistakes in the article. I suggest all text to be justify because it is not.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method is well explained. The authors should explain the abbreviation CBRT and TurkStat. Not, everybody knows that when you are first time introducing a term.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

I think that on page 12 when the author explains the results she says that: "Industry-related FDI has a negative but statistically insignificant long-run coefficient, implying that.....". As I can see from the results presented in Table 4 industry-related FDI have negative and statistically significant effect over growth. So, the author should either check and change the results in the Table or check and change the interpretation of the results and the same part in the abstract.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes the conclusion is fine and adequate.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes, but the author might try to find some newer literature about the effects of FDI in Turkey after 2020 and reference them in the Table 1.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I suggest the author to check and change the indicated results and interpretation that I have directed: Industry-related FDI has a negative but statistically insignificant long-run coefficient, implying that.....". As I can see from the results presented in Table 4 industry-related FDI have negative and statistically significant effect over growth. So, the author should either check and change the results in the Table or check and change the interpretation of the results and the same part in the abstract.

The author might try to find some newer literature about the effects of FDI in Turkey after 2020 and reference them in the Table 1.

The authors should explain the abbreviation CBRT and TurkStat.