



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_6472
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL PUBLIC CAPITAL EXPENDITURE AND AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA 1961 - 2010
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The paper is publishable with the following retail revisions. <i>In the abstract</i> Line 1: the word "aims " should be replaced with "aim" unless if the author has another aim to add Line 3: study design should be collapsed in the methodology. Line 12: Conclusion very much seems like a suggestion, if it is, the right word should reflect. <i>In Page 2.</i> Lines 35-39: the author mentioned available statistics but the source was not acknowledged. The author should provide few lines after conclusion under the heading of policy implication and explain summarily the implications of the results of the paper on a related policy in Nigeria.	These corrections has been done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The content of the paper seems original but the grammar requires attention. The author should try and be direct in expressions. There is no flow in the write up, at times one is not sure of what to meet next. There should be flow for easy comprehension and understanding.	This comment has been done. There is cohesion in the paper now.



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--