



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_26967
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMETRIC MODELING OF INCOME-CONSUMPTION RELATIONSHIP: EVIDENCE FROM NIGERIA
Type of the 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	- Describe the term 'income-consumption' beginning second paragraph - Too brief literature reviewed to form a strong argument for research gap - Line 42 & 53 reference and year missing - Give a brief short on methodology used showing how you will achieve study objectives and answers for research questions. This is missing..... - Update data trend graph to 2015-line 98 - Trend graph fig no. missing - Results in table 2.0 not exhaustively interpreted eg Probability/t-values - Key to explain model abbreviations missing – line 136- 143 – does this mean $ppce_t$ and $pcdi_t$ are the same????line 175 - Give key for all abbreviations in your equations!!!!!! Line 169-174 - The results in table 5.0 should be exhaustively interpreted otherwise what value do they add to this paper??? $-\theta_i$	ALL THESE COMMENTS HAVE BEEN ATTENDED TO IN THE MANUSCRIPT We did a major rework of the article. All methodological issues raised have been corrected. We used a new version of E-View to analyse the ARDL directly thereby boycotting the formal processes. The former Table 5 was the result of ARDL. It is now at the Appendix. A new Table 5 is exhaustively interpreted in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	□ □ □ θ₀ □ This part of the paper line 259-262 does not make sense?????/	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Format the document for grammar and punctuation	Document already formatted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Five (5)Key words/phrases below abstract required. The author has four (4). The keys word should be in italic 2. The paper is publishable after addressing the issues raised in this review	5 Keywords included