



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 REVISION comments	For a research paper Distributed lag (DL) model is outdated but may be used if it is necessary. There is a problem in the estimation of the model. It is said that the needed lag is 3. But how can you find the lag and what is the criterion? The resulted model is given with only lag (2). However, it may be better to give the level, lag(1) and lag(3) to compare the shown result. The conclusion part could be interpreted in more detail and it can be given more details regarding the interpretation of the empirical results. So the conclusion section can be extended. What are the limits of your research, this can be added.	The model was rather estimated at lag 2 of the exogenous variables (not 3 as mistakenly stated earlier). Correction made. The lag(2) obtained for LFGAS, LSGAS, and LSIGR was based on their p-values and the information criteria. Their level, lag(1) and lag(2) were eliminated during the simulation since they did not fit the model. The 'conclusion' part has been extended with the inclusion of recommendations. The limits of the study have been added in the 'conclusion' section.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are few language mistakes. I think it will be better some concepts i.e. "mono-economy, Wagner's Law, economic growth, Keynesian growth models" should be explained shortly. In the methodology section it is referred to Keynesian growth models and I think its place is wrong. Economic growth definition and Keynesian growth models can be referred shortly on review literature section.	We do not consider these definitions necessary.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is relevant for Nigeria. It is a short research paper and some revisions are required. There is no reference about oil revenue data and shares about federal allocations in the introduction section. I think their references should be given.	Reference added as recommended.