



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6441
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT GUARANTEE SCHEME FUND (ACGSF) ON DOMESTIC FOOD SUPPLY 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- The article needs a deep revision of the language, there are several grammatical errors (verb tense, prepositions, etc). - Two of the cited references are apparently not listed in "References": FGN, 2001 and CBN, 2011. They should be removed or included. - It seems that there are some problems of compatibility o misspelling in the document and some words/numbers appear together. It makes it difficult to understand (see table 1 for example or lines 35,72,257, among others) - In sources of data there should be an explanation about the features of the sample: frequency (monthly, annual...), number of elements of the sample at least. - It would be clarifying to include a figure with the evolution of DFS and ACGSF, so lines 110 to 122 could be easily understood. - I find the paper "unbalanced": long sections in 1 and 2 but 3. Methodology and 4.Data analysis are just a recompilation of data with no further considerations. - There is an important misunderstanding between the achieved results in the regression analysis and statements in the discussion. Authors have applied a log transformation on the variable (as inferred from Table1), although they do not take this fact into account when explaining these values (line 238). It is not possible to use the same coefficient, obtained with a transformed variable, in the explanation of the variable without transformation. In this sense, also the formulas beneath Table 1 should be modified. - Lastly, it should be noted that the statistical significance of the result is given by the t-statistic that is computed, not by the standard error (line 235).	NOTED NOTED NOTED
Minor REVISION comments	- It seems that there is an error in dates of the sample appearing in two different parts of the paper: line 216 and line 246.	
Optional/General comments	- The reference to Nigeriawiki, although correct, is something weird in an academic paper - Citation system doesn't follow the guidelines for authors in this journal	