



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5859
Title of the Manuscript:	Federation Account Allocation in Nigeria: Implication for Growth
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	-A much more comprehensive literature should be reviewed. There are a great number of studies concerning the econometric modelling of emerging countries, even in Nigeria. So, the paper should cover the relevant international econometric literature to support the questions being examined. -The manuscript needs proofreading. The author(s) should rewrite the paper according to a professional English editor's comments. -The data used in this study should be clarified. Also, it is not clear why they have preferred this method. Literature review should be helpful to make them all much clearer. -The regression and correlation analysis may need robustness. In this sense, the author(s) should consider the multicollinearity and goodness-of-fit tests to clarify the analyses. VIF and Hosmer-Lemeshow tests(or Wald test) can be performed to check the robustness. -The conclusion section seems to be a repetition of the findings. The author(s) should use the analysis results to suggest the contribution of the paper to the literature, to guide the further analysis and to comment on what policy and/or decision makers should do in the lights of these results. What do these relationships mean for the Nigerian economy?	Additional literature added. Data explained with additional plots and table. Conclusion improved Recommendations added



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-The title of the manuscript does not precisely compensate with the initial context of the study. A more convenient title should be chosen including both the years and the name of the analysis being performed. -The null hypotheses of the study may be written in an academic framework such as; H_0: -Table 1 does not represent the results to the readers who are not deal with statistical analysis. For instance, significance levels may be labelled with stars to signify the regression results. Also, the coefficients in Table 1 should be explained in detail to illustrate what they have found.	Title changed from “Federation Account Allocation in Nigeria: Implication for Growth” to “Fiscal Federalism in Nigeria: Implication for Growth”
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	-In the present form, the manuscript is under the standards of the Journal. The author(s) should make the corresponding revisions before the paper is recommended for the publication.	