



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_31783
Title of the Manuscript:	AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC HEALTH EXPENDITURE ON LIFE EXPECTANCY 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors of the present study performed an EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC HEALTH EXPENDITURE ON LIFE EXPECTANCY IN NIGERIA. This study made use of the recent bounds testing co-integration approach developed within the framework of the Autoregressive Distributed Lag econometric procedure to determine the long-run relationship between public spending on health and life expectancy in Nigeria, as stated by the authors of the current manuscript. The findings of their study recommend that government should introduce programmes that will enable people to be aware of the effect of carbon dioxide emissions on individual's health and should advise people and industries the appropriate measure to be taken and as well to separate residential and industrial areas, to avoid any hazard caused by carbon dioxide emissions. The authors also concluded that, the government should increase and restructure the public expenditure allocation to the health sector. The topic of this study is interesting and the findings are very valuable for Nigeria and for other African countries with similar economic status. The researchers have presented and explained their study in great detail using an appropriate language. However, there are some points to be revised, which are listed below: 1- On lines 10-12: The authors mentioned that "The study made an attempt to provide empirical evidence of the impact of public health expenditure on life expectancy in Nigeria using time series data spanning between 1981 and 2014.	*The choice of this period (1981-2014) in the Nigeria context marked the beginning of the era of pronounced institutional decay as well as health sector reforms in the country, that has not to some extent transformed into sustainable economic development. *Yes, it has been corrected on the original article, underline with yellow.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Why did they choose this time period specifically? 2- On lines 80-81: The authors have written that "... It is not clear the definition of life expectancy is the best definition for health capital". This sentence is gramatically not correct. 3- The manuscript is too long, it is more like a chapter from a book. Especially the literature part should be summarized. The readers can easily get bored and loose focus on the importance of the subject. 4- On line 182: The authors have written the following sentence which needs to be corrected gramatically. "In order to justify this generalization, they divid es public..." . 5- Throughout the manuscript, the authors used a numbering system such as Table 1.1, 1.2, etc. for tables. Why did not they number it as just Table 1, Table 2, etc... The same situation applies for the figures given in the manuscript as well. 6- In all the figures displayed by the authors, the titles of the x- and y-axes are missing (such as lines: 693-694, 712-713, 753-759).	*The literature part has been re-cast as suggested by the reviewers. Thank you. *It has been corrected in the manuscript. * It has been corrected as directed by the reviewers. *Lines: 693-694, 712-713, 753-759, this cannot show X and Y axis simply because is a regression outputs from e-views output direct result. Is not possible for X and Y axis to be relayed in the figures.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		