



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_15845
Title of the Manuscript:	Rural-urban migration in Nigeria: “who migrates most”? A case study of Ogun waterside local government area of Ogun State, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Papers

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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In pp. 1-2, the author(s) says: <i>Rural-urban migration is “the phenomenon of an unprecedented movement of people from the rural countryside to the burgeoning cities of Africa, Asia and Latin America”</i> [2]. In USA, Europe and other developed regions, there are also rural-urban migrations. The research question may be reformulated: 1) age and sex at migration, 2) year of migration by age and sex. In final pp 6 there is some typographic mistakes. Table 1 (and table 2 isn't necessary) may be presented by a figure of population pyramid,	This was a direct quotation from Todaro (1997)'s study. However, the reviewer's comment is right. Therefore the authors have decided to leave the quotation unaltered and have an addendum to the quotation. Please see the body of the article. The analysis were arranged in line with the research questions. Restating the research questions would mean rearranging the analysis to suit the research questions and merging the analysis of age and sex.at migration. We feel that this would be cumbersome. The typographical errors on page 6 have been corrected. These tables depict the respondents' answers to the research questions posed for



SDI Review Form 1.6

	including sex. Case processing summary in pp. 10 is not necessary (irrelevant). The discussion should be more self-critical. The methodology has serious limitations. The paragraph “conclusion” is not consistent with the presented data. The author should limit the conclusion to the empirical findings.	the study. If they are not convenient in the body of the article, may we suggest that they be taken to appendix and referred to in the body of the article? This has been deleted from the article Ok. Part of the discussion has been re-written. We have made some amendments here.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is a simple descriptive exercise, without the enough theory. The main interest is its potential to extrapolate data to other regions, countries and situations. In general, the paper has a lack in historical and international or global perspective. For a historical viewpoint, see: Van der Woude, A., Hayami, A., & De Vries, J. (1990). Urbanization in history: a process of dynamic interactions. For Global theories of territorial dynamics: García Docampo, M. (2014). Theories of Urban Dynamics. <i>International Journal of Population Research</i>, 2014.	
---	--	--