



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	1. The Introduction Section is poorly written and has to be re-written. The problem being investigated and the objectives are poorly articulated and the section lacks focus. There are also so many unpardonable grammatical errors. 2. There Literature Review Section has to be re-worked. While the study seeks to investigate the effect of Remittances (R) on National Household Disposable Income (NHDI), the literature review has focused on the uses to which R are put (consumption versus investment) as well as the determinants of R, with virtually no discussion on the relationship between remittances and disposable income. 3. In Section three, author discusses the theoretical framework (motives for sending remittances), and states that the framework allows the consideration of three special cases. He/she however discusses only two. (See page 10 paragraph 3). 4. The author tries to forecast NHDI in the short run (1980-2015) and in the long run (1980-2025). But it is not so clear whether or not forecast values were used in unit root tests and regression results (See Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, after testing for unit root, issues of cointegration and the like were not discussed. I also find the use of the terms "short run" and "long run" simply because estimations were done for the period 1980-2015 and 1980-2025 respectively inappropriate.	Introduction Section has be re-written and the objective is now clearly stated (see Correction) Literature Review is clearly in line. The National Household consumption and investment is a proxy for National Household Disposable Income. Is the income received by household after tax is what they consume and invest Corrected (see Correction) The objective is not to examine the variables cointegration but to study the dynamic impacts of remittances both in short and long run. The objective is now clearly stated.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. While the study finds the key variable, MRI, insignificant in both the 'short run' and 'long run' regressions, author makes authoritative statements like "The positive impact of MRI on NHD seem to be increasing in the long run ...". This has to be dealt with.	This statement have be dealt with (see correction)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	6. Several references were cited in the work put were not included in the list of references. Example, Abdul, Azeez and Begum, 2009 (page 2); Jorgen, 2004 (page 6); and many more. In some cases, only one author is cited in the work, but in the References Section, you see more than one name; example, Adams (2003) on page 4 but on Reference page it is Adams & Page. 7. The language is bad; with author committing a lot of grammatical errors. There are several spelling mistakes as well as typographical errors too. I do not think author has been diligent enough. This paper must be published only after author has reworked the paper to an acceptable standard.	Abdul-Azeez, K. M. and M. Begum, (2009) Adams, R. H and J. Page (2004) Adams, R.H. and J. Page (2003) Jorgen, C. (2004). Are all cited (see references) The work is now edited