



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 1. Introduction 2. Literature Review 3. Discussion 4. Conclusion	1. Author need to justify the study based on previous empirical evidences by identifying gaps and areas of improvement in the area. The rationale of the study also need to be stated in the last paragraph of the introduction before the scheme of sections. 2. Author should avoid detailed literature review in an empirical work, concise empirical review can be condensed in the introduction which can be used to identify gaps in the literature and areas that make the study unique or different from previous studies. 3. While discussing the relationship and findings, author need to explain logically the implications of the findings in relation to the concerned economy. 4. Author is expected to present a brief background, key findings and their implications, and suggestions in the conclusion section. Author need to justify the methods used based on empirical evidences and references from previous studies where applicable.	(1) The study justification, gap and rationale of the study is now added to the study (see the last paragraph of the literature review and the introduction) (2) Gaps have been identified in the study through the reviewed and condensed literatures (3) The implication of the findings from this study is discussed at the last paragraph under discussion and conclusion. (4) The discussion and conclusion now have a brief background, key findings and their implications, and suggestions. (5) The methodology now have some literatures to back it up (see section 4)
Minor REVISION comments 1. Title 2. References 3. Typos	1. Author may consider restructuring the title to draw the attention of the reader. As it is now, there is no logical connection between the words. 2. Author should revisit the reference section and include the missing references like Hotelling (1936), and page no. Is missing for some references. Also, the structure of some reference need to be changed. 3. Author should spare time to revisit the whole paper in order to avoid unnecessary typos and improve the quality of the paper	(1) The title have been restructured (2) The references have been restructured (3) I have read through the work and have reduced the typographical errors.
Optional/General comments		

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>	