

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

Murumba Inekwe<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Federal Polytechnic Idah

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Having read the paper I have the following comments and hope they will help improve the paper. In the abstract pensions/gratuities, and public debt is said to be non-significant and positive. The authors should note that where a result is insignificant, the issue of direction (positive or negative) is immaterial. How do the authors arrive at the recommendation of encouraging retirees to invest their pensions and gratuities in economic enhancing ventures and limit borrowing when their analysis was on payments of pensions and gratuities and not its investment? The hypothesized relationship between public debt payment and economic growth is not clear to support for recommendation put forward.

The authors stated that the study accepted the null hypotheses four and five that there is no significant impact of government expenditure on pensions and gratuities, and public debt serving on economic growth in Nigeria. The expression claiming that the null hypothesis is accepted is inappropriate. We either reject the null hypothesis or fail to reject the null hypothesis.

The empirical review seems unorganised. It would have been better structured and clearer if taken variable by variable and each review of a variable ends with the statement or formulation of hypothesis. That way the hypothesis will be clearer as per direction and easily identifiable, unlike the present situation where the apriori which are not very clear in some cases are assumed to be the hypotheses. Ordinarily, the hypotheses are to give raise to the research model. So, they ought to be clearly stated before the proposed research model.