



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/2386
Title of the Manuscript:	Export - led Growth or Growth - Driven Exports? Evidence from Nigeria.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- 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	1. The introduction is poorly done and scanty of citations of previous arguments, particularly, researchers from Nigeria. 2. There lots of grammatical errors, author should engage the services of expert to review the grammer. 3. The methodology of research is acceptable but the order of interpretations is wrong. 4. Conclusions are not driven from the research. 1. In line 79-82, the author seems to be confused about rejecting and accepting of hypothesis. If we reject H_0 it implies that we are automatically accepting hypothesis H_1. The author should clear the mix up. 2. Line 99-100. Interest rate na d expected inflation did not enter the model, why are testing for their stationarity. 3. Table 1 It is quite difficult to identify variables that are stationary at levels, first difference, etc. Therefore, the author should include columns to show the order of stationarity It will also be necessary to state their critical values 4. Table 2. Does not show the critical values from which we can make assertion about rejecting or accepting hypothesis. 5. Table 3 does not show the parsimonious error correction model that follows from an over-paramatised error correction model. The parsimonious model could be used to interpret the long run OLS result. 6. In table 5, The result should show one value of ECM	Ok. done Ok. Read again Ok. Re visit Ok. DONE We restated the hypotheses Error. Deleted Ok Comments are commendable and were carefully considered



SDI Review Form 1.6

	per model and ECM must always be negative which shows the speed of adjustment to equilibrium. Thus result of table 5 is porous and misleading. 7. The number of references is scanty and insufficient for this manner of research. It probably shows that the authors did not undertake sufficient study of the subject matter.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The work requires major revisions. 1. Refer to lines 34 – 38. The statements are disjointed. What did the author mean by “.....but by the spectacular story of four Asian Tigers” 2. Refer to lines 40-47. Citing authors names without stating what researches they did and their conclusion makes no meaning. 3. Refer to line 54-62. Though the intended methodology is good and acceptable, author does not need to be repetitive in mentioning the methodologies.	We have re-framed the expression. A paragraph has been added to incorporate the observation Ok
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is quite an interesting paper, however, the author has not exhausted the novelty neither has the contributions of the work added to new knowledge. The author should undertake to correct the comments mentioned previously.	ok