SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: Federation Account Allocation in Nigeria: Implication for Growth General Introduction The paper examined Federation account allocation in Nigeria: Implication for Growth using dynamic model. The paper found that federal government allocation and the state governments' internally generated revenue has positive impact on economic growth on the long run while state governments' allocation share has negative impact on economic growth. This paper discussed some vital points that make it merit publication. General Comments This paper is well organized, the objectives are clearly stated and the methodology adopted is appropriate. Specific Comments Abstract	

	The abstract is well written but the author should look into the last two sentences "……contrary, result suggests that state governments' allocation share has negative impact on economic". Introduction The main objective of the introduction is to motivate the readers as to why the study is important which I believe the author has shown in the introduction of this paper. Statement of the problem The statement of the problem is well written as it raised an important issue that needs to be considered. Literature Review The literature review is alright but I could not see any study on this topic in Nigeria reviewed by the author. I think one or two papers must have been done on this topic in Nigeria. The author can look into this. Results	

	The techniques of analysis adopted by the author are quite robust and good. Conclusion The study is well written and it merit publication if the author could look into the points raised.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria**