

Reviewers Guide

PART A: Editorial Office Only

SECTION I

Reviewer's Name:	Dr. Gbadebo Odularu
E-Mail:	godularu@fara-africa.org
Discussion Paper Number:	2012-57
Title:	REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE NEXUS: A CASE STUDY OF ECOWAS
Authors:	Cosimo Magazzino

PART B: Reviewer Only

SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is quite a good paper and very relevant for the West African countries and sub-region as the global economic landscape becomes increasingly dynamic. 2. Typographical errors cut across a few sub-sections of the article
Introduction:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given that the paper is on West Africa, one expects the introductory section on page one to discuss about West Africa and not on Africa generally. In other words, there is a need to contextualize this introduction to reflect the West African scenario. 2. The article does not seem to have discussed its research questions glaringly. 3. The article needs to clearly articulate the main goal of the paper and the specific objectives. 4. The paper needs to develop a separate section on the background to the study which will discuss the trends in West African macroeconomic indicators.

Literature Review	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following text on page 6 is out of context: ‘Regional trade agreements seem to present Africa with a ‘lose-lose’ situation. If Africa does not..... for those exports (Yeats, 1998)’ 2. The literature review does not focus on the theme of the study which is on revenue and expenditure nexus. Rather, it focuses too much on monetary convergence issues at the expense of fiscal economics issues.
Methodology:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is okay but appears a bit cumbersome. 2. However, the study does not present any theoretical framework to support its analysis. 3. The econometric model was not specified at all. 4. Actually, the choice of the macroeconomic variables in the model (which the author failed to specify) will be questionable since there was no theoretical basis for the analysis.
Results:	<p>Okay, but I also thought all the results appear seemingly funny.</p>
Discussion: Conclusions and Policy Implications	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is okay. However, the conclusion section made a few policy recommendations which are irrelevant to West Africa, and therefore, out of context. The author should be able to intervene with some policy recommendations for West Africa and not to generalize them for African Monetary Fund and African Central Bank (see the last paragraph).

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:	Okay
Others:	1. I expect the author to discuss more about West Africa and not generalizing the study on Africa. This seemingly results in a misalignment between the paper and the topic.
Decision:	Please see section IV (recommendation) below.

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	3
Contribution To The Field:	3
Technical Quality:	3
Clarity Of Presentation :	2
Depth Of Research:	3

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	X
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	

SECTION V: Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):

- 2. I expect the author to contact the economists at ECOWAS, WAMI and other West African organizations to provide him/her with more information.**