



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics &amp; Sociology</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove all abbreviations from the abstract.</li> <li>2. Provide the structure or organisation of the study</li> <li>3. No literature review section. It must be added.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>5. Re-estimation of the models due to the need to update the study's observations.</li> <li>6. Rewrite the entire work by meticulously updating citations to 2018 or even 2019.</li> <li>7. No theoretical framework it must be added.</li> <li>8. The model specification does is not linked to previous study</li> <li>9. The findings of the study does not relate to any previous findings either by corroborating or disagreeing.</li> <li>10. Intent citation very poor</li> <li>11. No recent studies cited. Despite the flurry of literature on the subject matter.</li> <li>12. No justification for the study.</li> <li>13. Research problems not well articulated</li> <li>14. The VECM test is incomplete and requires AR inverse root, variance decomposition and impulse response test.</li> </ol> <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"> <li>1. All the abbreviations have been removed.</li> <li>2. On the issue of literature review, I was trying to summarize the whole paper, but it is now included in the revised paper.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. The citation in the paper is up to 2017.</li> <li>5. The theoretical framework is included in the revised paper.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

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