



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_4423
Title of the Manuscript:	Empirical Analysis of the Causal Relationship between electricity consumption and economic Growth in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 7 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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Below I present the list of the major remarks. 1. What matter most, the article needs language support as quality of English is rather poor, in particular: a. "There is diverse energy and environmental challenges facing the entire globe ranging from carbon emission" (line 36). b. "The direction of causality can be unidirectional, bidirectional or no causality between electricity consumption and economic growth" (line 57). c. "section one", "section two", etc. (line 70) d. "state of affairs" (line 77) e. "yearly" (line 106) f. "dependant" (line 208) g. "This section describes the method adopted in determining the causal direction between electricity consumption and GDP growth as well as the analyses of the data used." (line 264). h. "Ighodaro (2010) also established that causality runs from electricity consumption to economic growth as well as from gas utilization to economic growth while causality runs from economic growth to domestic crude oil production." i. "Non stationary" (line 389).	1. All the corrections from a to i including others had been done and highlighted in the main manuscript as advised. 2. All the other 'Compulsory Revision comments' have been given adequate corrections (line by line).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	2. Granger and Wald are surnames and must be begin with capital letter! 3. Line 10 and further on: “ Error Correction model (ECM) model” – do not repeat “model”. 4. Why in the paper numbers are spelled and then presented in parentheses (e.g. “nine (9)”) ? Seems senseless. 5. In Introduction the Authors refer to WEO (2009) – are there more recent sources (e.g. from 2012)? 6. The introduction should include at least one paragraph in which the motivation to perform the study would be clearly presented. 7. Some cited papers are missing in the References section, e.g. Okoro and Chikuni (2007). 8. In line 120 authors refer to 2005 electricity generation data. More recent data should be mentioned. 9. The sentence: “The obsolete state of the transmission network makes Nigeria experience double digit transmission and distribution losses, which are quite high by international standards (Iwayemi, 2008).” clearly repeats the content of the previous sentence. 10. I do not understand the sentence: “It is important to note that there have not been single results from the studies of various authors which may be due to the	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	methodology adopted, the nature of the data used or the time-frame of the data.” 11. Line 193: We do not say “run a cointegration”. We say “ran cointegration analysis” etc. 12. Trend cannot exhibit causality (line 215). 13. Line 275: The authors claim that they use ADF while the description refers <u>only</u> to DF test. 14. Line 281: “set of variables is cointegrated once the linear combination of them is stationary.” Formally, this is not a proper definition. See: Lütkepohl, H. 1993. Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis, second ed. Springer–Verlag, New York for details. 15. Equations 1 and 2: there is “t-1” instead of “t-i”. 16. Line 302: “variables to be tested” – in statistical tests we do not tests variables but hypotheses. 17. Line 306: In this context the “vice versa” is used incorrectly. 18. Line 313: the general form of ECM model does allow for more than one lag.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	1. Authors sometimes use “kwh” or “Kwh” – one notation should be used consequently. The same applies to “co-integration” and “cointegration”. 2. Do not use capital letter in “Unit root” (line 274). 3. Line 277: it should be H0 not Ho. 4. Why in the title only some words begin with capital letter? The same in case of “Error Correction <u>m</u>odel”. 5. Line 321: explain the meaning of “=N= millions”. 6. Evview7 is not a proper name of the software used. I use EViews 7. 7. Line 369: what does “PV” stand for? 8. Line 307. I would refer to original Granger’s papers instead of the Ighodaro’s one. 9. The meaning of “N520” should be explained in detail (line 161). 10. What does „BRICS” stand for? (line 139)? 11. Odularu (2009) (line 156) is an incorrect reference.	All the ‘Minor REVISION comments’ have also been attended to accordingly in the main manuscript.
---------------------------------------	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion, the topic of the paper is both interesting and important. When turning to the structure of the paper, I must underline that the paper quite effectively conveys the main findings and is understandable for a reader having some basic economic knowledge. In general, all sections of the paper are interesting and relevant. <u>However, there are some quite important issues (especially the quality of English), which, in my opinion, could significantly improve the quality of the paper.</u> Thus my recommendation to The Editorial Board of <i>BJEMT</i> is to <u>ask for revised version of the paper</u> in which the above remarks would be satisfactorily incorporated.	