



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_10618
Title of the Manuscript:	Deficit Financing and Economic Growth in Nigeria: A Preliminary Investigation.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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	Authors consider the incessant rises in government expenditure and the implications of deficit financing on Nigerian economic growth over the period 1970-2010. The authors have been quite successful in achieving their objective. In fact, I have only one comment. In line 517, the authors said “This implies that deficit financing impacts negatively on economic growth. Thus contradicts Okoye and Akenbor (2010) and Imobighe (2012)” What are the reasons of behind it, more explanation is needed.	Agreed, the conclusion of the authors to make up for the reasons is hereby included.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are quite a few typing errors in the paper. Proof-reading should have been done before submission. In addition, the math formulas and the tables are not very standard, these should be checked carefully.	Proof-reading done, however, the formulas and tables are standardised as presented.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		