



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_4879
Title of the Manuscript:	Remittance and the National Household Disposable Income in Nigeria (1980-2025): Dynamic Forecasting Approach
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 <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	Nothing was said about disposable income while the theoretical framework dwells mainly on what is already known- altruism, self-interest, etc without connection to the crux of the paper. Literature review, while so vague and verbose did not touch on works on remittances effects in Nigeria e.g Osili, Olowa, et al, Odozi, et al etc. Where is the place of disposable income in your analysis and why is there no robust analysis to show connection between Remittances and disposable income.	Equations 1,2 and 3 say much of household utility function. In theory, the household disposable income (income after tax) formed the household budget. The motivation to remit and altruism in section 3 modelled household disposable income. I do not need the works of Osili, Olowa, et al, Odozi, et al., because they are not relevant to my objective. This is a paper and not a thesis. The researcher is guided by the objective, which is to forecast the present and the future impacts of remittances on NHD in Nigeria.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	At best, what has been done can be described as determinant of remittances. Analysis did not focus paper's title. Problem is not well defined.	No, this reviewer totally missed the subject matter. If the subject focus was to be 'determinant of remittances' the dependent variable would have been remittances and not 'national household disposable income'. Therefore the Problem is well defined (see correction)