



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_29352
Title of the Manuscript:	Manufacturing Subsector and Economic Growth in Nigeria
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	1. The author is looking at two different topics in one study. The author should focus on his title "Manufacturing Subsector and Economic Growth in Nigeria". The model of institution quality and manufacturing should be for another study. The introduction and literature review focused on manufacturing and growth. The author only brought in manufacturing and institutions quality in the methodology. 2. The sub-title 2.2.1 "Performance of the industrial sector in Nigeria" does not provide much information. The author only provided the table about the contribution of manufacturing sector. It is better for the author to title it "Overview of manufacturing sector" and the author should dig further into the subsector in details or the author should remove it. 3. The author should look at the endogenous model adopted for this study. Endogenous model does not have double K (capital) as it is presented in the study. See equation 2 4. I will suggest the author should use Cob-Douglass production function specified in equation 3. As the model specified in equation 1 is that not necessary.	1. The title still remains manufacturing output and Economic Growth in Nigeria and the model of institutional quality has been removed 2. The title of the table has been changed to the overview of the manufacturing subsector. 3. The double K has been removed thanks for this observation it was a mistake. 4. The model specified form equation 1 to 3 is eclectic in nature a combination of two models both the Kaldor model and endogenous growth model and no changes will be effected thanks.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author is looking at two different topics in one study. This is confirmed in his conclusion "This study has attempted to assess the impact of manufacturing subsector on economic growth and the role of institutions in the development of the manufacturing sub sector of the Nigerian economy". Nothing was said about institution quality and manufacturing before the methodology. The introduction and literature review shows that the author is looking at Manufacturing Subsector and Economic Growth in Nigeria. Therefore the author should focus on it alone. The role of institutions in the development of the manufacturing sub sector of the Nigerian economy is another topic entirely.	The entire model on institutional quality has been removed am in total agreement thanks. Thanks for this quality and constructive review it has helped to improve the quality of this paper
---	--	---