



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The revision took care of the comments on the literature review, background and ECM model. However, the following corrections have to be made:	THANKS
The statement made in the abstract and conclusion about the cointegration of the models only apply to Model 2, so, it is wrong to generalise it other models.	OK
I advise you to plot your diagram such that all the years will show at the bottom.	Because of the number of years in the series, we felt the five-year range is ok.
The hypotheses should be restated such that each null and alternative will be together because it is confusing as they are. More so, I do not know the reason for using unconventional notations for the hypotheses (if even they intend to do this, then it should be consistent).	Done
The discussion of the hypotheses specified are clumsy and unclear. If the hypotheses are well specified, the explanation of the direction causality will not be problem.	Done
There is the need to include the critical values of the unit roots at both levels and first differences. It could be done at the bottom of the table. They should see studies that estimated time series unit roots.	Done
There is no need for the variance decomposition estimation. This study does not require this. So, it should be expunge from the paper.	Ok
While the conclusion should be rewritten to reflect these comments.	Done The constructive comments are taken into consideration and they are well appreciated