



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJAEES_15369
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Government Agricultural Expenditure on Agricultural Output in 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1) This article has too many similarities with an already published article:</p> <p>Iganiga, B.O., & Unemhilin, D.O.(2011). Impact of Government Agricultural Expenditure on Agricultural Output in Nigeria, Kamla-Raj Journal of Economics, 2(2), 81-88</p> <p>This article is available online on:</p> <p>http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JE/JE-02-0-000-11-Web/JE-02-2-000-11-Abst-PDF/JE-02-2-081-11-072-Iganiga-B-O/JE-02-2-081-11-072-Iganiga-B-O-Tt.pdf</p> <p>The article under review cannot pass as an original article because a close comparison of the 2 documents reveals that many sections especially the topic, introduction and conceptual framework/literature review were either plagiarised word for word or perhaps it is the same authors who are re-submitting the same work to a different journal but with minor alterations.</p> <p>It is suggested that this article should undergo some serious revision to drastically transform it into an original (as opposed to a disguised re-submitted) article!</p> <p>2) Reading through section "5.1: Summary of</p>	<p>The reviewer did a marvellous work, we appreciated him</p> <p>The structure of this paper had been changed. Few things were added and/or deleted.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>research findings”, one get the impression that the study does not explicitly bring out the correlation between agricultural expenditure and output as suggested by the topic.</p> <p>The summary only highlighted the following: “the hindrance- factor (.i.e. inflation and interest rates) that is responsible for the slow pace of the growth of agricultural sector hence economic growth, the inverse relationship between inflation rate and interest rate with the economic growth of Nigeria within the period under review and the macroeconomic environmental problems such as inflation pressure, general price level, interest rate, exchange rate, etc. BUT is silent on the main focus of the study which is to establish the impact of agricultural expenditure on output.</p> <p>3) The abstract should contain at least a statement on how the analytical methodology. The mention of E-view 7.2 which is a computer software does not add much value here. The reader needs to have a feel of how the data were collected and analysed (of course in one or two lines).</p> <p>4) The introduction should highlight the main concepts of agricultural expenditure and output as well as the correlation (or lack of).</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) THERE ARE SERIOUS GRAMMATICAL MISTAKES AND OMISSIONS:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. (EG. as economic growth whichstatistically significant at 5% level.b. Government should intensified effort on how to control inflation rate.c. Government should increase the budgetary allocation agricultural sector.d.the first and most basic to human life and/or survival is enduring food securitye. development of any nation depends to among other)2) IT'S NOT CLEAR WHAT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT MEANS: "The study employed E-view 7.2 statistical output as a window in exploring the possible links between government agricultural expenditure and agricultural output." PLEASE MAKE IT CLEARER	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) THE WRITING STYLE COULD BE IMPROVED EG. CONCORDIAL AGREEMENT, SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION, REPETITIONS ETC. For instance in the abstract, there are 4 sentences coming one after another but all starting with the words "Government should".2) THERE ARE NUMEROUS FORMATTING, SPACING AND TYPO ERROS. PLEASE READ THROUGH WHOLE DOCUMENT AND REVISE	