



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_51449
Title of the Manuscript:	On the Relationship between Government Expenditure on Economic and Social Service 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	<p>Abstract may either be written in past tense or simple present tense or simple present participle (APA Style, 2010). Adopt one style</p> <p>See p.1, line one: this paper examines</p> <p>See p.1, fourth line: the result shows</p> <p>See p.1, sixth line: the study also discovered</p> <p>See pp.2-4 appears as a personal communication as no authority (ies) were cited and referenced</p> <p>Literature review is the reviewing of the related research works, which had been done by other researchers. Therefore, literature review is related in past time or present tense, not using both at the same time (APA Style, 2010).</p> <p>See p.4, para 2, lheanacho E. (2011) (3) examines and initial is not attached to author's name in the body of the paper.</p> <p>See p.4, para 2, Fajingbesi and Odusola (1999) (4) empirically investigated</p> <p>See p.11, 'This study investigate' instead of 'this study investigates'</p> <p>See p.2, the first paragraph is too long without inciting reference (s)</p> <p>Perhaps the researcher used APA Style in referencing his work, therefore I urge the researcher to revisit the references.</p>	<p>(1) Abstract is written in simple tense</p> <p>(2) All the highlighted errors in p.1 have been corrected</p> <p>(3) Authors have been cited in p. 2 -4.</p> <p>(4) All literature are now written in past tense</p> <p>(5) lheanacho E. (2011) in p.4, para 2, have been correct to lheanacho (2011)</p> <p>(6) Fajingbesi and Odusola (1999) (4) in p.4, para 2 have been corrected.</p> <p>(7) On p. 11, 'This study investigates' have been corrected to 'this study investigate'</p> <p>(8) Relevant literatures have been cited for the paragraph on p.2</p> <p>(9) The references have been corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The study is quite interesting and scientific in approach, however few mistakes were discovered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The researcher did not include theoretical framework and/or, which is to be adopted for the study; The study was not adapted or hinged on any previous researcher's model to be built upon; Model specification was not shown in the work; Some of the references cited and referenced were relatively old, therefore, there is need to introduce latest researchers and referenced. 	<p>(1) The study now have a theoretical framework</p> <p>(2) The study now have a model specification</p> <p>(3) The study have been updated with recent literatures (see the literatures in red)</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The researcher identified a gap, which he closed in terms of estimation techniques and the study contributed to the existing knowledge or literature in terms of the Relationship between Government Expenditure on Economic and Social Service in Nigeria.</p>	Thank you

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	