**Editor’s Comment:**

The methodology section describes the use of VECM and related tests, but the sample size for VAT is smaller (28 vs. 36 for other variables, see Table 1), which is not explained. Please clarify this data limitation and its implications for the results.

While the VECM approach is appropriate, the model specification in section 3.2 is inconsistent: the initial model includes CED, but the final analysis omits it without justification. Please address this inconsistency.

In the results, the discussion states that “CIT, VAT and PPT have significant and favourable impacts on GDP,” but the impulse response and variance decomposition show that CIT’s long-run effect is negative and VAT’s effect grows over time. The conclusion should reflect these nuanced findings, not just the short-run results.
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