



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_11091
Title of the Manuscript:	Corruption, Institutional Quality And Economic Performance In An Emerging Economy: Lessons From Nigeria
Type of the 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	The authors need to (re)write a true introduction with explicit and clear motivations for their paper. They also need a detailed literature survey and the description of corruption, institutional quality and economic performance in Nigeria. Why the authors select the CIM to measure institutional quality? CIM measure judicial quality (Knack and Keefer, 1995; Chemin, 2009), Clague et al. (1999) discuss the CIM in detail. Thus, there may exist mutual causal relationship between CIM and Corruption. Unfortunately, the authors didn't take it into consideration. Additionally, the authors need to discuss the empirical results in detail.	An explicit motivation for the paper is included & highlighted in the last part of paragraph 4 in introduction. Also, a detailed description of corruption and institutional quality in Nigeria is included & highlighted in section 3. In the same vein, a detailed but a summary of selected macro-economic and social indicators are included & highlighted in paragraph 2 of introduction. We are very much aware that CIM measures judicial quality. But we used CIM to measure institutional quality because judicial quality, to a greater extent, undoubtedly determines institutional quality. Also, the existence of causality between institutional quality and corruption is uncertain. Naturally, "almost everything causes everything". Despite that, we carried out a correlation analysis between the two variables in order to avoid the problem of multicollinearity and the



SDI Review Form 1.6

		result revealed that the degree of correlation was very low. This is why the two variables were used and estimated as independent variables in one model equation. It should be noted that a weak institution may not necessarily be corrupt. Additionally, the empirical result is discussed in details under a new sub-section 5.2 in section 5. This new section is highlighted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Quality of presentation, extensive editing of English language and style were required	To the best of our ability, extensive and intensive editorial work is carried out to make the write-up more appealing.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is some questions about typesetting	We also did our best in typesetting and hoping that our best will be enough.