

## **General comment**

The topic of the paper is interesting. However, in the present form the original content of the paper is quite poor. The paper is badly written and too much fragmented, it lacks a clear and convincing motivation, and the empirical analysis is lightweight and unconvincing.

## **Detailed comments**

- 1) The English is not fluent and should be considerably improved.
- 2) The introduction is too much fragmented and the motivations of the paper are not well explained. Moreover, the author should provide in this section a bird's-eye view of the econometric techniques employed and of the major results obtained.
- 3) Throughout the paper one finds acronymic like WAEMU, CFA, WAMZ, WAEMU, CEMAC without any explanation. Assuming that not all the readers should know the recent history of Sub-Saharan countries, the author should provide a brief historical introduction explaining what are the African countries under analysis, which kind of international institutions they created, and what are the major differences between them such as the presence of a monetary union. The latter point is particularly relevant for discussing the empirical results of the paper.
- 4) The section on the literature review is at the same time too long, too fragmented and not providing the basic background information (see point 2 above) one expects to find in an empirical study on the effects of fiscal policies in sub-Saharan countries. The section should be better organized: in the present form, the reviewed papers are just listed one after the other without a clear plot.
- 5) In presenting the statistical tests employed in the paper, the author should explain better and more systematically what are the possible econometric problems and how the tests work, paying special attention to elicit the null hypotheses.
- 6) The author performs Granger-causality tests between fiscal variables for each country in the sample, but stationarity tests are performed only on panel data. As Granger-causality tests should be performed between stationary time series, the author should perform stationarity tests also at the country level. If the time series are too short to get reliable results, Granger-causality tests should be performed on both the levels and the first differences of the time series.
- 7) The discussion of the results of Granger-causality tests is telegraphic. As the original content of the paper stems mainly from this analysis and the results are mixed, the authors should provide a deeper discussion of the results providing possible explanations and interpretations.
- 8) In the final section, the author claims that he/she found that fiscal variables are pro-cyclical in WAEMU and ECOWAS countries. However, in the paper there is no trace of this results. How could he/she reach such a conclusion?

- 9) It is not clear to me the connection between the policy recommendations contained in the final section and the empirical results found in the paper.
- 10) The captions of figures 1 and 2 should be more informative.