



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
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

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors wrote the following in response to the first review: <i>The comments were noticed and all the necessary corrections made. We worked on all the part of the paper as suggested. We appreciate the comments.</i> My findings were, that apart from limited literature that was removed from the manuscript and the comment regarding the research objective some major comments were not given attention without a relevant response from the authors as to the reason for this. - The document needs serious language editing to bring it to an acceptable academic standard for publication - The average manuscript for a publication of this nature is in the region of 4000 words. This manuscript is over 13000 words, which in my opinion is mainly due to unnecessary literature - No attention was given to my comment regarding the literature discussion of the years under review, which just does not make sense in its present form: 1999 provides the budget objectives for that year 2000 Provides macro-economic performance for 1999 and 2000 2001 is omitted 2002 discusses inflation rate targets 2003 discusses GDP growth 2004 is omitted 2005 discusses state revenue growth Hence, my comment that the impression is created that the authors basically included any literature that they could find on a specific budget year, however unrelated. It is also not clear how this literature supports the hypotheses of the manuscript and subsequent findings - At one stage one source is used to include seven pages of literature (Olomola 2009) and the same author is again cited for another two pages later in the manuscript. In my opinion the main issue with this manuscript is the failure to properly justify the literature in support of the research hypothesis and subsequent quantitative analysis and its interpretation.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>L J Erasmus</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Public Sector Finance, Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa</i>