SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**2019/AJAEES/48640**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Agricultural Sector Expenditure on Nigerian Economy Growth**
Type of Article:	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
- The literature review is guilty of review listing. The essence of reviewing a literature is not to show just what others have done in the area of interest but to point out the gap, which the paper intends to fill. What you have done is to list out literature without any cohesive link to the topic or the problem of the study. i advice that the literature be written again, not in this list form, but in a more cohesive manner, where the gap in literature can be highlighted and the link to the problems in the paper is emphasized. - The following were listed as possible problems to the agriculture sector; inadequate access to credit, domestic consumption, forex and poor technology adoption. Other specific challenges include insufficient access to variety of seeds, access to land for investment, infrastructural deficiency majorly in power and transportation, poor commodity exchange /off-take agreement. However, none of these factors were taken into consideration in the model specification. If these are already known factors against the development of the agricultural sector, won't they determine the outcome of the model? Why exclude them? - The need for a theoretical framework does not mean any theory should be provided. The Keynesian and neoclassical theories on growth provided has to be incorporated in the study. You have to explain how it fits your area of interest and limitations of this theory. It is on this basis that a model, following the theory can be modified and specified to fit the paper. - I insist that the modelling is very wrong. First the dependent variable is supposed to be growth and not GDP. Secondly, you are simply saying that only agriculture output and expenditure are the only factors that determine Nigeria's GDP growth. That does not make any sense. If you want to localize your model to only agriculture, then you must first start with a Nigerian growth model, and use control variable to restrict your independent variables to only agriculture and allied variables. - Also, what informed you that this should be a linear model? Why did you take logs of all variables? Why not a log-linear model? - That the Johansen integration test signifies some form of long and short run relationship does not mean in reality there should be one. I could as well take a Johansen test between number of smokers and how many chickens are in a farm and still get a long run relationship. It is your duty as a researcher to identify and show why there should be such relationship prior to the test. Remember, economic theory is derived from reality. - You have not taken care of possible erogeneity problems as GDP may cause Agriculture output and vice versa. This is why I suspect your specification may not be correct. - At the end of the paper, I have asked the question, and so what? What has the paper arrived at? What is the policy recommendation? Why is this paper necessary? What is the contribution to the field of study? All these important components of a paper are conspicuously missing in this paper.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Chukwuemeka Onyimadu*
Department, University & Country	*National Institute for Legislative and Democratic Studies, Nigeria*