



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_9299
Title of the Manuscript:	Agriculture and Manufacturing Sector Growth in Namibia During the Period 1981 to 2012: A Granger Causality test
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	The objective of the paper is to study whether or not there is a causal relationship between growth of agriculture and of manufacturing, and also to determine the direction of the relationship if it exists. The paper is well written and highly readable. The literature review is relatively short but covers some of the recent studies. The organization of the paper is also good. The contribution of the paper to the existing body of knowledge is not very significant. However, the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The unit root and cointegrations tests are performed correctly. In order to test the Granger causality, instead of using a bivariate model, few control variables could have been introduced.	We expanded our literature review by adding five more sources. We have refocused the paper by only looking at the time series 1981-2012 to prevent ambiguity. We removed cointegration after realising that with stationarity confirmed, the role of cointegration was not necessary.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(a) Instead of referring to studies listed under references by the number, authors' names with the year of publication would be more suitable. For example, in line 46, reference [1] can be replaced with National Planning Commission (2012). If this approach is followed, references should be listed in an alphabetical order. (b) There are many typographical errors in the	The rules as prescribed for the British Journal of Economics, Trade and management requires in text citation to be done by means of numbers while in the references the use of names should be followed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manuscripts. Some of them may be due to formatting of the document. For example, on line 14, the term investigatingwhether should be changed to investigating whether. Similar mistakes can be found in lines 21, 22, 30, 33, 35, 41, 61, 79, 90, 116, 139, 147, 193, 202, and 223. (c) In Line 170, the author states that "The ADF test results show that the test statistic are smaller (in absolute value) than the 5% critical value." However, the test statistics are larger than the critical values.	We addressed the error in the initial paper regarding test statistics and concentrated more on the outcome.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Instead of estimating the model for the period 1991 to 2012, the author could introduce a dummy variable to capture the independence period while using the data set for the 1980-2012 period.	We removed the 1991 to 2012 era in our analysis to avoid being misunderstood and instead we focused more on the once off long time series from 1981 – 2012. In this case we did not have to introduce any dummy.