

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_89892
Title of the Manuscript:	DOES PUBLIC DEBT DETERMINE ECONOMIC GROWTH; EVIDENCE FROM NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. The Paper is poorly organised. It is written in the shape of a thesis. The author need to restructure the entire paper. Most of the sub headings are unnecessary. For example there should be one heading of Introduction the sub headings of</p> <p>1.1 Background of the Study 1.2 Statement of the Problem 1.3 Objectives of the Study 1.4 Research Questions 1.5 Statement of Hypotheses</p> <p>are of no use. Same is for other sections of the paper.</p> <p>2. In this paper, the review of literature section is very weak. Provide a very systematic review instead of putting the individual review that takes lot of space. There is plethora of works in this topic, find out the rationale of this study. Find out the research gap and develop the research hypothesis further. Furthermore, authors have merely listed out the studies without even creating a debate among them. Without that debate and thoughtful contradictions, the research gap cannot be substantiated. The table is of no use.</p> <p>3. The policy recommendations are completely vague, and it seems that the authors already had the policies in mind before even starting the paper. The policies should be directly derived from the discussion of the results, and they should not go beyond the results.</p> <p>4. All tables should be properly prepared with appropriate headings etc. The reproducing of eviews results in table 4.2, 4.2.2 etc. is not appropriate. Before preparing these results author must follow some standard papers.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Naeem Akram
Department, University & Country	Pakistan