SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_BJEMT_25026**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Remittance: Consumed Or Invested? A Macro-Model of the Nigerian Economy**
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	First, it is to be noted that the manuscript deals with a subject that is obviously important, not only for Nigeria but in general to all countries that have a significant number of immigrants. Beyond this fact, it seems to use an appropriate and sophisticated methodology. So it seems strange that the authors commit basic errors, some of which I shall spell out: 1. Starting in the abstract it is stated that "the results show that remittance significantly induces consumption expenditure, but depresses investment expenditure and output growth in Nigeria. Specifically, when 1% remittance is received in Nigeria, it significantly induces consumption spending by 2.1% but insignificantly depresses investment spending and growth by 6.4% and 03% respectively, ceteris paribus." If there is no significance in the effect on investment and on growth, then one cannot say that the effect is depressing. 2. With respect to the estimation techniques, i.e. OLS, AR or ML, the authors state that [page 5] "In our estimation, however, OLS was utilized. The choice was informed by the size of our model and the robustness of the technique." To be honest, I never came across these arguments, in particular, the size of the model, could be used to justify the use of OLS, which is even often less robust than the AR or ML. 3. The authors claim [page 9] "Different test statistics	Abstract corrected Estimation technique used was changed from OLS to SUR. Efforts were made without success to improve the DW statistics. Hence, the authors accept the low DW. The use of SUR technique improved the results.

	for the three models confirm the robustness of the estimates. In fact, the value of the DW statistic for the third model, indicates a bad specification. Note also that the authors state that the DW tests the correlation between the explanatory variables [2nd paragraph, page 9] when obviously it does it in relation to residuals. Finally, probably as a result of some bad specification, the results are strange to the extent that remittances positively influence consumption - which is different to say they are consumed - but do not do it in relation to growth, as that positive effect on consumption should be spread out to growth. If this does not happen, it is because there are other depressive **and** significant effects on other variables, which the models do not contemplate	
Minor REVISION comments	When submitting a manuscript, it should be avoided not presenting the results of all the tests. See page 5 on the unit roots and co-integration tests.	
Optional/General comments		