



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>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When making definitive statements, there is need for providing the source of such statements of facts. The referencing of such statements of facts is inadequate. The author may refer to comments on the paper. 2. The paper has no literature review or theoretical framework. Therefore, the methodology used seems to be ad-hoc and has no relatable flow with the objective of the paper. 3. The methodology is simplistic and not justified. The model is wrongly specified and cannot realistically fit the objective of the paper. 4. i do not see the connection between your background and the objective of the paper. Examining the trend of agriculture expenditure on economic growth is totally different from providing an overview on policies aimed at improving the agricultural sector, which your background focuses on. The background has to reflect the issues you intend to focus on in the paper. 5. No control variables, no explanations on the choice of variable form, or need to include logs of variables. Why? From the model, are you assuming that only government expenditure and agricultural output influence the GDP? No other economic variable could be added to the model? Why? 6. No economic interpretation of the results were provided. No benchmark from the literature was given thus no way to relate to the findings. Also there is a need to compare results with A'priori expectations which were also not provided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Majority of the issue raised by the reviewer has been corrected in the manuscript. Also, I believe some of the reviewer comments is based on the omission of the literature reviews, which is now included in the revised paper. 2. I agree that not only government expenditure and agricultural output influence the GDP, but the choice of variable use was as a result of availability of data. <p>Thank you</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammatical errors 	
Optional/General comments	The paper is poorly done. Major sections of any research paper (literature review, theoretical review, justification of methodology, apriori expectations, and an economic interpretation of findings) is missing.	The literature review, theoretical review, justification of methodology are included in the revised paper. It was an omission

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>	