



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_27712
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DETERMINANTS OF DOMESTIC PRIVATE SAVINGS IN NIGERIA
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
To be sure, let me reproduce the comments of mine which were totally ignored or responded in an unsatisfactory way: Compulsory REVISION comments "In what concerns task iii., I consider appropriate the econometric methodology used in the manuscript but, on the other hand, since the raw data was not made available, it is impossible to verify if the methodology was indeed correctly applied. Therefore, I recommend that the raw data is made available." Once again, the authors did not provide the raw data. Again, this made impossible to verify the results that were provided in the annexed file: dom_sav_result_for_publ.docx. "In order to convince the readers that the manuscript is filling some gap in the literature, I recommend that the authors clearly show on which aspects is the manuscript different/better from the following references (which were not cited): [...]" The authors' response was to provide an annexed file with a table where some characteristics of the identified references are offered. Does this mean that they are not be included in the main body of the manuscript? If so, why did not the authors fully accomplished to my compulsory revision comment? Minor REVISION comments "I recommend that, in the list of references, the same formatting should be used." This revision comment was ignored by the authors. Just to be sure, let me reproduce two references in the manuscript: "Keynes, J.M (1936), General theory of employment, invest and money. London: MacMillan Company Ltd." "Lewis, A. (1970). <i>The theory of economic growth</i>. New York: Harper and Row." By the way, please note the obvious typo in the first (of those two) references. "Furthermore, the following references should be obviously corrected: • Malthus, Robert. T. (1951). Principles of political economics. New York. 317. • Smith A. (1776). An enquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations, University of glasgows • Teshome, G. Kassa, B. Emanas, B. and Haji, J. (2013). Determinants of rural household" To this comment of mine the authors' response was "1.The references has been corrected". This is totally unacceptable as those three references are exactly as they were in the original version of the manuscript.	It is important to note that we may have responded in an unsatisfactory way but there was no intention to ignore the reviewer's comment. Though in our opinion the demand for raw data is strange, we have attached it as requested. The reviewer was not specific on whether the gap should be included in the body of the manuscript or simply provided to convince him that the manuscript is filling some gap, knowing that we did not review the suggested works. However, we have included the gap in the body of the manuscript as implied by his current position. The references have now been corrected as recommended It appears that the corrections previously made were not properly saved, hence this mix up. These have been taken care of. As explained above, it seems that the corrections made were not properly saved of which we are sorry, however, this has been corrected as noted.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

"I also recommend that the word "granger" should be replaced by "Granger" (page 1: line 10; page 8: line 339; page 18: lines 610 & 614)"

To this comment of mine the authors' response was "2. word granger replaced with Granger as suggested". This is not totally accurate as in pages 8 and 18 there is still the word "granger".