



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Some relevant contributions are not cited and discussed: i.e., Magazzino, C., Mele, M., (2012), The Determinants of Health Expenditure in Italian Regions, <i>International Journal of Economics and Finance</i>, 4, 3, 61-72, March, DOI: 10.5539/ijef.v4n3p61; Magazzino, C., Mele, M., (2011), Health Care Expenditure and Economic Growth in Southern Italian Regions: an Empirical Analysis, <i>Rassegna Economica</i>, 20, 51-65. The methodology and empirical strategy are not discussed in detail. Comparisons with previous studies are missed. If the data in Table 1.7 are correct, the model is completely wrong, given the presence of heteroskedasticity, serial correlation, omitted variables bias. The author states: “All the tests disclosed that the model has a satisfactory econometric properties, it has a correct functional form and the model's residuals are serially uncorrelated, normally distributed and homoskedastic. In other words, the outcomes reported are serially uncorrelated, normally distributed and homoskedastic.” It is exactly the opposite! The English-style is extremely poor, and the paper must be revised by a proof-reader. The editing is very poor and not in accordance with the journal's guidelines.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cosimo Magazzino
Department, University & Country	Department of Political Sciences, Roma Tre University, Italy