



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_12545
Title of the Manuscript:	PROGRESSIVITY OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING ON PRIMARY HEALTH CARE: EVIDENCE FROM RURAL COMMUNITIES OF EDO STATE, NIGERIA.
Type of the 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 99 looks like an aim to me. Please state specific objectives In you literature review I have not a single case from Nigeria Where are figures 1 to 4?	Estimation of the benefit incidence of government spending on health (child vaccination, prenatal and postnatal consultations in public health institutions) in rural areas of Edo State. According to Van de Walle (1995), the study of distributional outcomes of public spending stems from three main sources (1) dissatisfaction with distributional outcomes in the absence of intervention. Market failures may leave many households facing acute poverty. This may be the reason for protest and violence in some parts of Nigeria. Information on distributional impacts, particularly the extent to which the poorest strata benefit can help in making those choices. All these sources are inherent in the public system in Nigeria hence, according to Alabiet <i>al</i> (2011), there is the need to study distributional outcome of public spending in Nigeria. The error has been corrected with figure 5-11 renunbered 1-6



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 48 should be <i>et al</i> , Line 113 should be <i>Rasmus et al</i> . Line 119 should be <i>Gupta et al</i> . Line 124 should be <i>Hamid et al</i> . Line 136 should be italicized <i>Castro-Leal et al</i> . Legends of figures should be written below the graphs	<i>et al</i> , <i>et al</i> , <i>et al</i> , <i>et al</i> , <i>Castro-Leal et al</i> . Legends of figures written below the graphs.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The article has contributed to knowledge	