



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1886
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTMENT IN TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA: A MULTIVARIATE APPROACH

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments

This paper deals with a fashionable and interesting topic. Thus, the main focus of the paper is offering a method to try to assess the impact of telecommunications infrastructure on economic growth. This is based on a more general theoretical framework of macroeconomic theory. Policy implications are enough justified and the conclusions worth consideration.

The paper is well written and motivated, and also offers a well conducted and detailed survey of previous literature on the field.

The application of a 3SLS procedure is appropriate. And the data set seems to be unique and valuable.

Overall the paper is interesting, fits with the journal and moves the literature forward. However in the current stage, the paper needs to be revised since there is a couple of minor mistakes and some stylistic issues to be addressed.

- Page 1, lines 35-36, the use of "In Nigeria" (twice) seems to me redundant.
- Page 2, line 69; and page 3, line 80, "NCC, 2011" is not within the references list.
- Page 3, line 87, NBS and CBN (acronyms) should be defined before in the text.
- Page 3, line 92, "World Fact Book on Nigeria (2007) is not within the references list.
- Page 3, line 96, "World Development Indicators (2044) is not within the references list.
- Page 3, line 111, the et al. format should be used in Cronin, Colleran... reference. The 1991 paper is not within the references

- Corrected.
- Corrected. NCC now fully defined and referenced
- Corrected. NBS and CBN now fully defined
- Corrected. "World Fact Book on Nigeria (2007)" redundant therefore deleted.
- Corrected. Citation now included in the Reference (The World Bank, 2004)
- Corrected. Reference now included



SDI Review Form 1.6

list. - Page 4, line 115, the et al. format should be used in Allerman, Hunt,... reference. - Page 5, line 165, the authors must be consistent in their use of “and” or “&”. - Page 5, second full paragraph and third full paragraph, most of the references cited are not within the references list. Please, go through them and correct. - Page 5, line 174, Which is the year for Sridhar and Sridhar? 2005 or 2007? Please, clarify. - Page 6, first full paragraph, Gold (2010), Ajiboye et al. (2007) and Anyasi and Otubu (2009) are not within the references list. - Page 6, line 217, Zellner and Theil, 1962 is not within the references list. - Page 6, line 299, the “and” is missed in “(Jarque, Bera, 1980). - Page, 8, line 314, perhaps the call to the “Appendix 1” including the definition of the variables should be placed in page 7, before the equations. - Page 12, line 424, Anayasi and Otubu (200) is not within the references list. - References section, there are several references included here but not cited within the whole text: Central Bank of Nigeria (2008); international Telecommunications Union (2004), (2005) and (2007); Nigeria Communications Commission (2007), (2009) and (2012); United States Energy Information Administration Independent Statistics and Analysis (2010); Wang, E. C. (2002).	- Disagree. <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association</i> (APA) 6th edition referencing format permits the mentioning of 3 to 5 Authors' names at the first mention, thereafter, 'et al.' will apply - Corrected. - Corrected. Relevant references now included. - Corrected. Sridhar (2005) applies. - Corrected. References now included. - Corrected. Reference now included. - Corrected. - Corrected. - Corrected. Reference now included. - Corrected. References now deleted.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	