SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	**2013_BJAST_3706**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Development of the Solid Minerals sector of Oyo State: strategies for a safe haven for investors**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
I would like to first commend the author's on providing this updated version and I personally have found this paper interesting to read. While more informative rather than research oriented, I think it brings value to the international community on a topic of importance. **I do have suggestions that I feel would enhance this paper from a research perspective as I have noted the author's have now included a method section (while very brief). These are highlighted below** **Recommendations:** **1. I would suggest that this paper is in need of an English edit prior to publication.** **2. The abstract has not been updated from the original version. Given the content change I would suggest the abstract needs to be updated, and prior to updating I would suggest the author's make the following changes to the manuscript body. These are highlighted next. I would suggest the author changes the abstract after addressing the additional comments below.** **3. Introduction: I do not feel the first paragraph offers any value and I would suggest deleting it. The real content appropriate to the context of this paper begins in the second paragraph. Last paragraph: I would suggest changing the first sentence of the last paragraph to – *It is the intention of the authors' through this paper, to describe the current mining scenario and recent policy reforms in Nigeria. In addition, the paper will elaborate of key issues that are important for mining investment including Artisanal Small-Scale mining and Free, Prior and Informed Consent.*** **4. Materials and Methods: I suggest changing this paragraph to: *The development of this paper has relied upon international literature related to mining and investment (including World Bank and Fraser Institute publications), recent studies specific to the Nigerian context (including studies and activities carried out by the Nigerian Geological Survey Agency), interview data with key participants who represent global mining experts and, the author's personal experience in exploration activities specific to Nigeria .*** It would strengthen the paper to expand on the research aspect of the studies mentioned. I would suggest the author's use 2 paragraphs to describe in detail the studies identified (including objective, methodological and analysis approach). Also, I noted in the final section of the results section, there is a section where some sort of comparison with the Fraser Institutes criteria occurred. This will need elaboration in the methods section. **5. The next section should be titled Results and Discussion:** **In this section it would be of value to link the results of the actual research that was undertaken with the methods section (so if the paper reports on three studies, which it**	

apprears it may, it elaborates on study 1. In methods, and then this is the first described in the results. This format would be carried on throughout the section. **Section 3.3. – I would suggest giving the heading – Nigerian Mining Policy** **It is not clear what the author's are presenting in this section. There is some very worthwhile content, but it is not clear how the evaluation against the 'checklist' occurred. I think if the author's spent a bit more time elaborating the methodology section, this would make this section clearer. Since there was interest in comparing Nigeria with the Fraser Institutes criteria, it would be helpful for the author to describe briefly the objective and purpose of the survey in the method section that describes why and how this comparison occurred.** **Overall: I think this draft is stronger than the one I reviewed initially. I would strongly suggest the author's view the method's section of other peer-reviewed journal papers prior to submitting their final version to ensure that they have the format and appropriate content correct (thus making it very likely that it will be ready for publication).**	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer