



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	Abstract – it is not self-explanatory. - what kind of secondary data? - do not use abbreviations (LNFSRGDP; LNPSC) that are not yet described in the paper; - it is not clear what the difference is between base-line and sensitivity model; - recommendation are too general; Keywords: please do not repeat the words from the title; Introduction: - Row 32 – References? - Rows 40 to 50– Use up to date references; - Rows 59 up to 79 – use relevant references! - The authors use 100 rows to talk about the financial sector reforms in Nigeria (51 – 102). After reading that section it is not clear about what type of reforms are the authors refers to. That section should be shortened and more clear; - 108 to 125 is material and method; Literature review: - too long and unclear; - this section should be incorporated in the introduction part; - Row 131 contradiction with row 25: “The importance of the financial system to economic development is not a clear-cut issue” – “The issue if financial sector reforms has taken the centre stage in the world’s economy; - Rows 169 to 219 : the authors should better underline the relevance of the exiting literature to the present study; Material and Methods: - Row 235 to 244 and 252 - 256: are not relevant for the study; - 258 up to 263 please describe the data type used in the study; - Row 269 – what means FSRGDP1? Please present the relation between FSRGDP1 and FSRGDP;	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Rows 281 – 290: the data use in the model should be better explain – savings and income – how you measure them? Did you take into account the inflation rate?; what type of interest rate and exchange rate? - 304 to 313 use better mathematical writing; - what means t? - 318 – 350 please rewrite equations 7 to 14 in a better format; - equation 343 please check the second LN coefficient! - explain the meaning of the coefficients used for the first time in the paper ($\varphi_{0-7}, \theta_{0-7}, \lambda, \beta_{0-7}, \gamma_{0-7}, \Psi_{0-7}$) - section 378 – 400 not necessary if the author present below the model equations the meaning for the missing coefficients; - the author should cite other relevant studies that use the same research methods! <u>Results and Discussion</u> - 474 – 488 better explain the reasons for the performed test (unit root test; SIC; robustness; etc). What was the software used for the data analyse? - the results should be presented more clear!!! - tables 2 and 3 are repeated. Use the tables only once! - create a new subsection – Discussion and compare your findings with the most relevant ones from the literature; <u>Conclusion and Recommendations:</u> - it is too long! - point out only the most important findings;	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ionel-Mugurel Jitea
Department, University & Country	Economic Sciences, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania