



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_26268
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimising Capacity of Nigeria Construction Sector for Socio-Economic Sustainability
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>)



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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript deals with a relevant subject, i.e. the well-known importance of the construction sector in most economies. As is known, the most appropriate methodology to study this subject is the input-output analysis (see the pioneering study of Carter, NG (1963). An Input-Output Analysis of the Nigerian Economy, 1959-1960). Instead, the authors decided to use an econometric methodology, which would be acceptable if, in fact, had been well used, which did not happen. First, as is known, any regression analysis must be preceded by stationarity tests (on the variables), which apparently did not happen. Secondly, the use of regression methods with so few observations involves the risk of nothing can be concluded, in significant terms. It was basically this is what happened with the results of the manuscript. Thus, the results do not support the conclusions, which obviously is not acceptable. On the one hand, it is recognized that: "The study established that a unit change in growth of construction sector actually caused some changes in the total GDP growth. Though this change was not significant [...]." (see the abstract and/or lines 337-340) but, on the other hand, it is concluded that "The result implied that the Nigeria construction sector holds great potentials for improving the national economy" (see the abstract and/or lines 375-376). By the way, the fact that the intercept of the regression is significantly different from	Recent studies of economic issues have adopted econometric methodology so also this study (see Saka, N. and Lowe, J. (2010); Salami, D. and Kelikume, I. (2011) ; Yusuf, M. A. (2016)). The study has carried out stationarity test to determine if the trend has a unit root or not. Furthermore, besides ordinary least square regression analysis, cointegration test and causality test were carried on the variables to determine the most stationary linear combination of the time series variables under consideration and the direction of the causation between the two variables respectively. Meanwhile, the number of observations has been increased by using quarterly data from 2010 q1 to 2015 q4 as against annual data. The issue raised with respect to the results of this study has been adequately addressed with the conclusion agreeing with the findings while considering the ethics of the journal.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	zero as indicated in lines 333-334, does not allow to conclude that: " The result therefore implied that an increase in construction growth would certainly cause a change in the growth of total GDP. (see lines 334-335). There does not seem to exist any ethical issue in the manuscript.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In section 2, which is called Literature Review, is not occupied with a review of the literature.	Literature review has been included in the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		