



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. This study did not show any results of interview from participants? 2. The results section directly show Fig 5, what was Fig1-4? 3. There was 306 respondents/sample for primary data, but how much population in rural areas of Edo state? Was it representative?	Results of interview with participant form the primary data that were analyzed to derive the progressive graph. The error has been corrected with figure 5-11 renumbered 1-6. The 360 respondents gave a fair representation of the population of the rural population since multistage sample technique was used in the survey design.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Please describe the context of questionnaire and interview schedule.	The data for this study was generated from primary and secondary sources. The primary data was obtained from a cross section of households made up of individuals who were expected to benefit from public spending. That is the poor and non-poor. The secondary data were obtained from relevant journals, government publications and the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). Two separate instruments, a questionnaire which asked questions on household health outcomes, out of pocket expenditure on health and government subsidy on healthcare delivery and an interview schedule designed to obtain data from the illiterate respondents and government healthcare providers were used in the survey. The structured



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. Please explain the process of participants' recruitment. How many participants were recruited (primary study) and studies from Journal to obtain the secondary data? 3. Line 67, 68: Section 1.1 and 1.2 was incorrect edition. 4. Did this study obtain ethical approval?	questionnaire was administered on the beneficiaries of public spending with the sole aim of ensuring that such respondents are treated discreetly. A multistage sampling technique was used in the selection of the respondents for the study. This was based on the geo-political division of the state. Accordingly, three senatorial districts are discernable, viz: Edo South, Edo Central, and Edo The first stage was the random selection of two (2) LGAs from each senatorial district to give a total of six (6) LGAs. The second stage was the random selection of three (3) communities from each of the LGAs giving a total of eighteen (18) communities, excluding the LGA headquarters which are assumed to be urban. This is done in order to concentrate research efforts on rural areas which most of the time are neglected in the distribution of social services. Finally, twenty (20) respondents were randomly selected from each community to make a total of three hundred and sixty (360) respondents. A pilot survey was carried out prior to the distribution of the questionnaire to determine the ethical robustness of the instrument. 1.2 has been deleted A pilot survey was carried out prior to the distribution of the questionnaire to determine the ethical robustness of the instrument.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		