



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1868
Title of the Manuscript:	Nigeria Vision 20: 2020: A Reality or a Mirage

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The paper is interesting, focuses on an important subject and it is well written but there are some weaknesses that require attention.	
Specific comments:	The motivation regarding the study and its contribution to macroeconomic policy or scientific knowledge is not very clear. Furthermore, the results of the study have not been discussed. The language is generally OK but the manuscript requires a thorough language editing. There are too long sentences here and there.	
Title and abstract	Line 11: Change percentage to rate. Line 12: Delete ADF and remove the bracket. Line 13: Change indicate to showed. Line 16: Change indicate to showed Line 21: Change about 27.3 years to more than 27 years.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Line 54, 55: Be specific! Delete no less than. Lines 52-55: This sentence requires reference(s). Lines 55-60, 60-67: These sentences are too long. Try to shorten. Lines 60-67, 69-72: Supply references. Line 77: Should read "how long will it take her" Lines 78-84: Delete starting from "knowing how far" Lines 99-103: Delete it does not connect well. Lines 149-154: Delete, i.e. from "we have numerated reasons. Motivation regarding the study is weak and not very clear. Explain the motivation regarding the study just before writing the objectives and after objectives explain the contribution of the study to macroeconomic policy and the existing scientific knowledge on the subject of the study. Lines 86-149 should come before the objectives. The objective is flat try to put more motivation to it. The literature review section is very weak and does not connect well to the objectives of the study. Only few literatures were cited here!	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Most of the references in the paper appear to be from the 1990s. More current references in the subject are required.	
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be	The method is relatively OK. Lines 223-225, 276-280: Supply references	



SDI Review Form 1.5

<i>provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)</i>	Data sources: This section is too short. There is a need to have a short description of the Nigeria economy and her macroeconomic policy. Lines 379-380: Supply reference	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant 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?)	Results section is relatively OK but some description of methods found in this section should be transferred to the methods section. For example, lines 390-396 do not belong to results. Delete line 396, i.e. the results from the ADF tests are reported in Table 1. Lines 397 should read "Tables 1A and 1B." Line 470: What is Rule 72? Discussion section is missing: The results have not been discussed! I suggest that the author(s) should discuss the results, link it to the existing literatures on the subject and say what is particularly different in this paper. Discuss what could be done to help Nigeria achieve the vision 20.	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	Could not find competing interest issues.	
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)	Lines 518-524, 542-544 are repetitions. Delete Policy implications have not been explained in detail	
References	Include more current references on the subject of the paper.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Eugene Ezebilo
Department, University & Country	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden