



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_48640
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Agricultural Sector Expenditure on Nigerian Economy Growth
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove all abbreviations from the abstract. 2. Provide the structure or organisation of the study 3. No literature review section. It must be added. 4. Expand the scope of the study to 2017 or 2018. The 2015 is too far back a period. Data are available on the variables you employed from 1981 to 2018. Kindly access the CBN statistical bulletin. 5. Re-estimation of the models due to the need to update the study's observations. 6. Rewrite the entire work by meticulously updating citations to 2018 or even 2019. 7. No theoretical framework it must be added. 8. The model specification does is not linked to previous study 9. The findings of the study does not relate to any previous findings either by corroborating or disagreeing. 10. Intent citation very poor 11. No recent studies cited. Despite the flurry of literature on the subject matter. 12. No justification for the study. 13. Research problems not well articulated 14. The VECM test is incomplete and requires AR inverse root, variance decomposition and impulse response test. <p>I candidly admonish the author to overhaul the entire work. Read relevant articles and implement all recommendations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the abbreviations have been removed. 2. On the issue of literature review, I was trying to summarize the whole paper, but it is now included in the revised paper. 3. I am ok with the scope presented. Expanding the scope of the study to 2017 or 2018 will means to redo the analysis from the beginning. It will be considered in future. 4. The citation in the paper is up to 2017. 5. The theoretical framework is included in the revised paper. 6. Lastly, I presume some of the reviewer comments is based on the omission of the literature reviews, which is now included in the revised paper. <p>Thank you.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

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