

Paper: “Agricultural Output, Government Expenditure and Economic Growth in Nigeria: A Gregory-Hansen Cointegration Test with Structural Breaks”

Submitted: 11 October 2021

Accepted: 08 December 2021

Published: 31 December 2021

Corresponding Author: Ali Salisu

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n41p38](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n41p38)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Sule Magaji
University of Abuja, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Nadira Madaki
Federal University Dutse, Jigawa, Nigeria

Reviewer 4: Jurate Savickiene
Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 16/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Agricultural output, Government expenditure and Economic growth in Nigeria: A Gregory-Hansen Cointegration test with Structural breaks	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1074/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The paper provides adequate value additions in the context of economics</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract represent the main body of the paper</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are little Grammatical cases in the paper</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The Methodology also represent the goal of the paper</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The result is Clear and precise</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The Conclusions and Summary of the paper are clear and adequate</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The reference Style is ok</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The Author(s) have demonstrated the important of the paper because it has contributed to the knowledge in the field of Economics as a disciplines

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The Editors system and Styles of arranging publication is essentials and would help the young Researchers to improves their capacity, Ability and becomes an independent in the area of their interest.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 15/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 18/10/2021
Manuscript Title: Agricultural output, Government expenditure and Economic growth in Nigeria: A Gregory-Hansen Cointegration test with Structural breaks	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1074/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
(The title of the paper matched with content)	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
(The Abstract of the is adequate as it contains objective, methodology, findings and recommendations)	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
(The paper contains few grammatical errors which needs to be adjusted)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
(The study has no problem with the methodology)	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
(The results are perfectly presented)	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
(The study presented clear conclusion and recommendations)	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
(The references are intact)	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s): Authors should review to correct the minor Grammatical error.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The pattern and style of the editor are interesting, hence the opportunity of academic Researcher would be improving.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 25 oct 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26 oct 2021
Manuscript Title: Agricultural output, Government expenditure and Economic growth in Nigeria: A Gregory-Hansen Cointegration test with Structural breaks	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1074/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No NO	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No NO	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The Paper presents a very interesting topic.

The abstract is clearly written. However, I would emphasize the paper's conclusions more strongly.

The Review literature is well written and up to date.

The empirical analysis is clear and well structured.

The conclusions are consistent with the paper. However I recommend more imprint on the results obtained from the empirical analysis.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Jurate Savickiene	
University/Country: Vytautas Magnus University / Lithuania	
Date Manuscript Received: 28/10/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 04/11/2021
Manuscript Title: Agricultural output, Government expenditure and Economic growth in Nigeria: A Gregory-Hansen Cointegration test with Structural breaks	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 74.10.2021	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The abstract should be more brief. Meanwhile, it should be more clear to present the results and the methodology. The abstract is not clearly present object.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few grammatical errors in manuscript.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The research methods could be explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The aim and tasks of the article are not written in the article introduction.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Some latest references should be added.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The aim of the paper should be assessed more uniformly through the paper. Moreover, the authors should start with a clear question(s) that will be answered. The objectives and/or research questions section would help to summarize and focus the overall aim of the study and improve the conclusions section, once the main ideas are clearly systematized. As far as the methodological approach is concerning, the section "Research Methodology" requires further explanation for a full comprehension of the analysis and for replication.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

