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	

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	**1. Johansen Cointegration Test: In Johansen Test, variables must be non-stationary at level and must be stationary in the first difference form. In this paper, authors find that agriculture and manufacturing output growth rates are stationary in their level as well as in their first and second difference. Therefore, they cannot use Johansen's test for cointegration. Actually, it is not needed. Since the variables are stationary at level, so thus its residuals, there is no need to check whether its residuals are stationary. All cointegration tests should be removed.** **2. The authors conduct two Granger causality tests to find a different causal relationship between colonial-era and post-colonial era. For this, they should compare years of 1980 to 1990 and years of 1991 to 2012, not years of 1980 to 2012 and years of 1991 to 2012. Simply years from 1980 to 2012 includes years from 1991 to 2012, it cannot be compared correctly. Since the conclusion is based on the incorrect empirical results, it is hard to believe that the conclusion is trustworthy.** **3. Namibia became independent in 1990. Was there a real economic change in 1990 and after? If yes, the authors need to support this argument with an empirical test such as Chow test or Hansen test.**	
Minor REVISION comments	**1. The authors mention about logistics and say that this is one of the crucial sectors that need special**	

	attention. However, I do not see any strong relationship between this sentence and paper's empirical results. What is the point of mentioning logistics?	
Optional/General comments	**N/A**	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer