



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19478
Title of the Manuscript:	Decentralization and Local Government Autonomy: A Quest for Quality Service Delivery in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper refers to rich, relevant literature, both at international and regional level. However, I consider that a subchapter should be added concerning the legal regime of decentralization and local autonomy (containing also comparative assertions from French, Anglo-Saxon law etc.). In this context, the author could introduce appreciations on the approach of these topics in the European Union.	Reviewer's recommendation as regard the specific aspects of the 1999 constitution that assigned autonomous powers to the local government has been effected. A comparative analysis of French, German and English decentralization laws was also included.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the subchapter on decentralization there is an incorrect conclusion that devolution/deconcentration is a form of decentralization. A normative/legal analysis shows that both decentralization and devolution/ deconcentration represent two processes enabling the transfer of competences of administrative feature from central level of the state to lower one, local communities. The differences between the two processes are presented, on one hand, in view of their purposes, at devolution/deconcentration the aim being decongestion of the state command center, and for decentralization the aim is a recognition of the possibility of self-administration of the local communities. On the other hand, in devolution/deconcentration the bodies acting at local level are appointed by government and liable to government, being subordinated, while at decentralization, the local authorities are most often the outcome of	About the forms of decentralization, the authors discussed two perspectives presented by two different schools of thought on decentralization. One of the perspectives believes that devolution / deconcentration is a form of decentralization. With this amendment, the opinion expressed by the reviewer has been adequately addressed. Appropriate references were made to the Constitutional framework and legal nature of decentralization and local government autonomy.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	local elections. Therefore, we believe that it is important to complete the general framework of the paper with references of legal nature, more consistent. The author should express more attention for quotations: the re quotations without mentioning the year, pages (JJ Rousseau etc.) as well as quotations without source (line186-187,etc) or without mentioning the pages (line 195,etc).	Quotations without year and source of information have been addressed as observed by the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		