



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 (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	1. The objective put forward is conflicting on lines 109 and 122. One talks of channel while the focus is on the effect... 2. The literature review is not up-to-date. I understand the latest date the author utilized is 2008 while we are in 2014. 3. The review only covered macroeconomic policies without relating reviews on agricultural programs promoted by financial institutions and related agencies to substantiate their impacts. 4. Lines 233 to 256 are not necessary. 5. The second sentence on line 262 ; i.e. "...because of long-term..." is not a justification at all. Proffer reasonable justification. 6. The number of observations for the period 1970-2009 sample should be clearly stated in the method specification. 7. The variable PSC needs re-visitation because we have private sector credit to agriculture, industry, etc. Pls specify. 8. Line 489, "source" is not necessary. This should be applied to all tables or figures generated by the author himself. 9. Preferable proxies for Agricultural investment should have been incentives to farmers, bank collateral requirements on loanable funds to farmers, etc...	-Corrected, see manuscript. -The literature review is up-to-date because the research was done in 2011, completed in 2012 with data covering 1970-2009 since sources used for data collection could only provide up to 2009. Besides, other reviewers have commented positively on the paper. Lastly, I could have published the work since 2013 but was looking out for a good journal such as this with strong and constructive reviewers so as to avoid the problem of predatory journals. -It is in order because agriculture is linked and interrelates with the rest of the economy. This interrelation is highly vulnerable to changes in other sectors, especially microeconomic policies. Besides, the aspect of agricultural programmes has been published already. 4. Corrected; 5. Corrected. 6. Noted. Treated. It is in order The proxies used in the study for agricultural investment is in order.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>aMinor</u> REVISION comments	1. Line 114 has wrong spelling for “regarded”. 2. The Lamda in Line 372 to 397 may be tabulated for easy presentation of correlation. 3. Definition of terms such as VAR, VD etc should not ne necessary.	-Corrected -Not necessary - It is in order
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The main VAR results should be allowed in the body of the work while the unit root tests etc should be moved to appendix.	Subject to journal directive