SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJEMT_24842**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Impact of Domestic Debt on Agricultural Output in Nigeria (1990-2014)**
Type of the Article	**Review paper**

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	**Introduction** The paper needs general revision. Most of the statements are not complete such as line 42, 65-66. The choice of tenses needs to be revised such as line 81-85. Method of reference is poor. The author uses 'et al' for two names see line 119 and compares with line 224. Some names appear et al without prior list of the names such as line 126. The justification given for the use of the estimation technique is not appropriate. Conventionally, OLS is used for long-run estimation not short-run unless some manipulations are done which are not found in the presence paper. The paper has no justification for the use of VECM and this method is not used for speed of adjustment. It is quite different from ECM. Of what importance is the use of Granger causality test in this paper? No clear objective to be achieved in this paper. Please check. The author needs to first state the initial model specified by Ogunbiyi et al (2015) and shows clearly the modification that was done before concluding for analysis. The inclusions of the variables in the model are not justified. **Results and Discussion** This paper has no convincing results. All the results presented do not follow principles in Econometrics and lack plausibility. The author needs to re-run the model and follow the required principles. Time series properties before OLS estimation. Even, a good result should have descriptive statistics, normality test- Jarque-	Your observations have been addressed.

	Bera test result, Serial Autocorrelation test and Heteroskedasticity test results. All these are missing. Although, the unit-root test was performed but not used appropriately in the study. The results of unit-root test does not lead to estimation of Johansen Cointegration test since all the variables are not I(1) series. Thus, the author needs to use Autoregressive Distributed Lag-Model to capture the results emanated from unit-root test or apply dynamic OLS method. The interpretations of the results are not conventional and lack clarity. **Conclusion** Since the results cum methodology are not appropriate, the conclusion drawn from the previous results may be faulty. The author needs to revise this aspect completely after using appropriate techniques and clearly state the objective of his/her study.	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical problem	
Optional/General comments		