

# Review of: "Government expenditure and economic growth: evidence from the critical sectors in an emerging economy"

Ibukun James Olaoye

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## **Reviewer's Report on the Proposal Entitled "Government expenditure and economic growth: evidence from the critical sectors in an emerging economy."**

This paper seeks to examine the effect of government expenditure on economic growth in Nigeria using time series data spanning from 1981 to 2020. The empirical analysis used include Augmented Dickey-Fuller for unit root test, Johansen co-integration test and Vector Error Correction Model. Although the topic is an important one, but need rephrasing "Government expenditure and economic growth: evidence from the critical sectors in Nigeria. The authors address some of the issues indicated below.

### **Specific comments:**

1. The whole paper needs thorough English editing/ review.
2. Generally, the introduction is a bit shallow and need to be strengthened by briefly discussing with recent data of issues around all the variable of interest in the study to provide enough background information.
3. It is important for the author(s) to provides a schematic framework that better explained the relationship between the variables. This will help readers to understand the relationship among the variables better and the flow of the relationship. It is good to always have a conceptual framework (figure) to show the relationship between your independent variables, intervening variables and dependent (outcome) variable.
4. Beyond the key findings by the studies reviewed (empirical review subsection section), take the reader through their why and how to better understand what the scholars reported. Or try to provide the reason/logical stories behind findings to motivate the readers. (Always note that it is good you take the reader through the stories behind the findings in all the above studies your review under your empirical review. i.e., it goes beyond reporting their key findings alone). The author spends more time and space representing what the previous studies reported as their key findings and it make little sense.
5. The methodology needs to be revised. The author(s) failed to explained the proxy for economic growth and why the choice? The period of data coverage was not referenced apart from what was stated in the abstract. This is not proper. I suggest the author present details of the methodology and how the measurement of the variables was constructed and whether any form of data transformation was done.
6. The table format is not too proper for journal publication. The author should follow appropriate journal standard format.
7. The recommendation needs to be specified.

8. I do not enjoy reading the manuscript because the authors make use of some words that are not appropriate for academic writing especially in the introduction and conclusion.

Thank you.