



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 (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 structure of the paper is not very appropriate. Section 1 should contain only the Introduction, while Section 2 should be devoted to the literary review. The model in eq. 1 is not discussed neither compared with similar researches. Description of data is completely absent. For robustness checks, the Johansen and Juselius cointegration procedure should be presented and discussed. Moreover, diagnostic tests are missed (autocorrelation, stability, normality, multi-collinearity, etc.). The causality analysis is not investigated.	This compulsory revision comment has been done. The paper strictly follow the guideline of the journal in organizing its work. All models and equation have been properly discussed and compared with similar researches. Data has been described in section 2.2.1. Johansen cointegration test, relevant diagnostic test like DW test, and Granger causality test has all been done.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Literature review should contain researches on disaggregated public expenditure-aggregate income nexus.	This was already done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some typos should be fixed (i.e., line 211: where). Equations 2-5 should be written with an equation editor.	This comment has been corrected