



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11423
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF FINANCIAL SECTOR REFORMS ON AGRICULTURAL GROWTH IN NIGERIA: A VECTOR AUTOREGRESSIVE (VAR) APPROACH
Type of the 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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Some cited materials in text, but missing from the reference list should be added. Examples include: Robinson, 1952 (line 132); Hicks, 1969 (line 133); De Gregorio and Guidotti, 1985 (line 2016); Honda, 2003 (line 192); Mackinnon et al., 1999 (lines 508-509; 512-513; 733-734; 737-738); Lorde, Jackson & Thomas, 2009 (line 504); etc. 2. Inconsistency and absence of uniformity in the referencing style for cited materials by more than two authors. Examples of these include: a. In text: Moore et al., 2006 (line 192), Beck et al., 2000 (line 207); Hassan et al., 1996 (line 560); Levine et al., 2000 (line 357) against Moore, Green & Murinde, 2006 (line 191); La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifa & Vishey, 1997 (line 215); Lorde, Jackson & Thomas, 2009 (line 504), etc. b. In the reference list: GreenWood, J. & Jovanovic, B. (1990) in line with the second author's surname coming before the initial as against Edwards, J.S. & K. Fischer (1994) in line 817 with the second author's surname coming after the initial.	All corrected, see manuscript All corrected, see manuscript All corrected, see manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	3. Some inconsistency observed in the dates of cited materials in text and reference list. Examples a. Chuku, Effiong & Sam, 2010 (line 300) against Chuku, A.C., Effiong, E.L. & Sam, N.R. (2011) in line 808. 4. Observed mix-ups in spelling of cited authors' names. Examples: a. Darlauf, 2001 (line 210) against Darlof, S.N. (2001) in line 811; b. Edwards & Fisher, 1994 (line 215) against Edwards, J.S. & K. Fischer (1994) in line 817. c. Levine & Zarvos, 1998 (line 206-207) against Levine, R. & Zervos (1998) in line 857. d. Caprio and Klingebiel (1995) in line 180 against Caprio, G. 7 Klingebrial, D. (1995) in line 800	All corrected, see manuscript All corrected, see manuscript
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Research & methods. Comment: The methods of data collection and analysis are suitable. Paper has good theoretical background and relevant literature was cited. Results & discussion Comment: Well-written and highly empirical paper. Relevant references were cited. Data and statistical analyses were suitable and sufficient for the study and conclusion drawn. Conclusion Comment: Conclusion was supported by data discussed References Comment: Cited references were relevant and adequate. However, the observations noted (under Minor Revision comments) could assist in adding to the quality of the paper:	
---	---	--