



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	BritishJournalofEconomics,Management&Trade
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15293
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Inflation Rate on the Economic Growth in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 paper is in many fields professionally conducted. However, some revisions must be made before publishing. 1) The paper is very static, in the way that it conducts an analysis by adopting relevant econometrics. However, it lacks a proper evaluation and discussion of the results. It also lacks a proper motivation for the choice of methodology. 2) I miss a proper discussion of the validity and reliability of the dataset used. 3) Control variables need a more substantial place in the econometric analysis. 4) The paper lacks a proper comparative analysis, which makes it possible to elaborate more on the results. 5) The two last sections of the paper should be strongly revised. Instead of writing a Summary (5.0), I would suggest Conclusions. Section 5.1. is very strange to me. Is this a research paper or an advisory paper? I would have left the section out, and included parts of the content in a discussion of the results.	We appreciate the reviewer for his efforts to spot the errors and/or criticisms in this paper. We wish to state here that all the corrections have been corrected as recommended by the reviewer. The literature review of this paper has enough comparative of countries. We need to emphasis that the variables that form the model for this study are sufficient to explain the situational (or inflationary) report in Nigeria. And result findings were encouraging, while the recommendations are expected to yield direct result.
Minor REVISION comments	1) The literature review in the early part of the manuscript mixes theory, modelling and	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	empirical research. It has to be made better structurally. 2) The language does really not comply to good English, and must be tightened significantly. 3) The abstract at the beginning of the paper is too long and holds too much information.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1) The research question is clear. However to me this seems more as a methodological exercise than an analytical discussion. 2) I would suggest another title: Impact of Inflation on Economic Growth in Nigeria	