



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19556
Title of the Manuscript:	BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION AND CONTROL REFORMS: TOOL FOR MACRO ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA. (1999-2013).
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 (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	- Theoretical framework The assumption of the research is that Government budget generates economic growth. Therefore, the theory that drives the study must be clarified and its hypothesis and utilization have to be presented, in order to facilitate the comprehension of the paper's purpose. - Literature review The literature review is relevant because allows situating the importance of the paper and to discuss the results. Roughly 65% of the references were published before 2010 and also the discussion of the paper's findings must be improved. Therefore, the authors could consider the possibility of improving the literature review. - Methodological issues a) The research was made through the gathering data from questionnaires.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Therefore, such a questionnaire must have the property of really gauging the concept it was made to do so. Therefore, the validity of used instrument has to be showed, throughout the presentation of international journals' published papers that applied the same questionnaire. b) The 5 point <i>Likert</i> scale was chose to collect data. However, it could lead to a central choice bias. So, the authors must inform which action was done to prevent it. c) The results have to be controlled by different sources of data and variables. In the table of 1999 budget implementation and all of other, there is the information of economic growth had to be above 3 per cent a year. The authors posit that economic growth was below such a figure and it becomes a central finding of the study. However, the WorldBank data on Nigeria (databank.worldbank.org/data/views/reports/tableview.aspx) show the economic growth ranged from 3 to 13 per cent, what is the opposite of the alleged by the authors. It is recommendable to regress the economic growth variables on the Government budget deviation and international crude oil prices in order to strengthen the results that were obtained from the respondents.	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- In the line #286, Obadan (2008) must be corrected	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Alexandre Ripamonti</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Sao Paulo, Brazil</i>