

Review of: "Health Outcome and Economic Growth: The Case of Malaria in Nigeria"

Atinuke Adebajji¹

¹ Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I read the earlier version of the paper, so some of my comments might have been addressed.

Abstract

I find the abstract rather hard to follow. The language is not succinct and rather overly flowery, which made it difficult to tease out the substance of the study. The abstract should have the problem/objectives, scope, methods, findings, and the import of the findings. Fewer words are better if the essential information is communicated.

The first sentence in the research design should be in the abstract.

The sentence 'there may be a need to double health expenditure' is rather ambivalent. The exact or approximate amount needed should be indicated. Science is exact for most practical purposes. On the proposed free education for primary and secondary schooling, what improvement will this bring? This can be deduced from the analysis. The abstract is silent on the main findings from the analysis and the import of the values. The authors should also know that primary education is officially free in Nigeria, despite which 10.5 million children aged 5 to 14 years are not in school (Basic Education at Unicef.org).

GCF is defined, but not GCFR in equation (ii).

The α_i 's are not properly matched to the alphas in equation (iii). $\alpha_2 \rightarrow \text{GHE}$, $\alpha_3 \rightarrow \text{IOM}$,

$\alpha_4 \rightarrow \text{GCF}$, $\alpha_5 \rightarrow \text{SES}$. Delta and lambda are undefined.

The discussion after the tables is, for the most part, a repetition of the figures in words. The import of the values and comparisons across variables should be the focus.

The table numbering was serially done; the same should be done for the figures.

Any word that does not serve a purpose should be taken out.

The criteria for the test for cointegration should be revisited for correctness.

The authors should conclude on the results of the analysis and not go beyond the scope of the study. The same should be done for the recommendations.

