



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_4879
Title of the Manuscript:	Remittance and the National Household Disposable Income in Nigeria (1980-2025): Dynamic Forecasting Approach

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. The variable $\log NHD(-2)_t$ in the equation (8) is not professional notation. Is it two-year-lagged variable (t-2)? 2. The author tested stationarity of the variables in the paper and shown that LOGNHD, LOGBTR, LOGCER, LOGEGS and LOGPER were integrated at I(1)and LOGMRI was I(2). The author states "the OLS estimates are taken log difference data." , but, Table 2, we find only these variables in the log format. It is not clear whether the author use first difference or second difference of these variables to estimate empirical model. In my understanding, if the variable is I(1) then the author will need to take first difference, and if it is I(2) then the second difference is used. Please clarify this. 3. The paper's reference format still is fragmental and arbitrary. The format of the reference list still is not standard, capital letters and lowercase letters are missed somewhere. 4. There are many typographical errors in this paper. In particular, on page 4, 6-8 and Table 1, Table2.	Let me ignore the zero (level) year and change it to two-year lagged variable, this will create an understating. The forecasts was from the (t-0, t-1 and t-2), which considered as three year moving average I did a manual log transformation of the series before generating the difference automatically, in line with the unit root test. Auto generation will not give the D sign of differenced. This is only possible in Eview 5, 6 and 7. What to do: Highlight the series and open as group, then click on Default, then Differenced. In running the unit root test for LOGMRI at the 1st diff, it was significant at 5% and 10% critical Values, but I test further to make it significant at 1%, 5% and 10% critical Values. This gave ADF test result of -20.239 and this is above the average of -6.0689. I took the average I(1) for all, because -20.239 seem to be an outlier All Corrected (check) corrected