



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_11239
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Growth, Income Redistribution and Poverty Reduction: Experiences from Rural Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The data used in this study did not come specifically from rural areas, thus the issue of rural Nigeria as reflected in the title is misnomer Instead of using per capita expenditure, it would have been much better for the author(s) to use the adult equivalence per capita expenditure considering the importance of dependent in the households. The observed differences in the poverty thresholds between 1996 and 2004 should have been based on real values not nominal values. Line 350-351- ??? how is that statement substantiated??? The Shapley decomposition has both the growth and redistribution components, but does the growth component stands for economic growth as reflected in this work? The recommendation and policy statements should be very concise and should be based on the specific findings	The main focus of this research is rural dwellers who form the bulk of producers of food consumed in the country. The 1996 National Consumer Survey(NCS) and 2003/2004 Nigeria Living Standard Survey (NLSS) data have both the rural and urban components but the rural components were used for the analysis. The rural components have now been included in the methodology as highlighted. Just like other authors in Nigeria such as Aigbokhan (1991, 1997), Canagarajah et al. (1997, 2001), and Federal Office of Statistics (FOS, 1997) who adopted ratios (one-third and two-thirds) of mean income/expenditure as a basis for defining the poverty line, this study used household per capita expenditure as a proxy for well being. Other forms of per capita expenditure including adult equivalent per capita were also attempted during the analysis but household expenditure gave decomposition results that could easily be explained. Meanwhile the Shapley decomposition explanations rely on the transfer sensitive poverty severity or FGT(2) measure which takes care of the poorest among the poor. The observed difference in poverty threshold for the two periods has been brought to real value already. Notationally, if the base year poverty line is denoted by Z_{1996} and 2004 poverty line is denoted by Z_{2004}, an index denoted by Z_{1996} / Z_{2004} is generated. The unit of this index is now used to normalise household <i>per capita</i> expenditure of individual households in 2004. The threshold difference statement has been reconstructed in the manuscript. Line (350-351). That was the period when democratically elected government was not yet in place in the country. There was no serious economic reform policy that could lead to equitable distribution of resources.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		In this study, the change in income between the two periods of study i.e (1996 and 2004) represents economic growth and it represents growth component in Shapley decomposition. This also goes in line with Bourguignon (2003), (see theoretical framework) which states that change in the distribution of income can be decomposed into two effects. First, there is the effect of a proportional change in all incomes that leaves the distribution of relative income unchanged known as a <i>growth</i> effect. Second, there is the effect of a change in the distribution of relative incomes which, by definition, is independent of the mean known as a <i>distributional</i> effect. This has been addressed. The recommendations and policy statements are now based on findings.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Check line 323, it is unemployment and interest rate not unemployment band interest rate	This has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		