



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12243
Title of the Manuscript:	INFORMAL INSTITUTIONS: THE BINDING CONSTRAINT ON INSTITUTIONAL EFFICIENCY IN 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 (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	The author should draw figures in the better size.	AGREED. This has been corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The topic of the research is "informal institution". But the text has many mix data about formal and informal ones. Even we see some findings about formal institutions there. So it is better to change the topic or rearrange the context.	The topic is NOT "Informal Institutions", but "Informal Institutions: the Binding Constraint on formal institutional Efficiency in Nigeria". Clearly, the object of the research is to juxtapose the two strands of institutions and then show how one compromises the efficiency of the other. We cannot talk on informal institution without showing how it weakens the effectiveness of the formal. This calls for providing the relevant context in which they relate and operate. Again, the research questions proposed at the introductory sections indicate that it is our aim to view the relative effectiveness of the two and then show how one constrains the other's effectiveness.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		