

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_91175
Title of the Manuscript:	Political economy of greenhouse gas emissions and human security threat in the Niger Delta Region, 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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p><b>Abstract, title and references:</b></p> <p><b>Here are my thoughts on the abstract, title, references:</b></p> <p><b>1- Abstract:</b> I am not a big fan, but I totally understand using an unstructured abstract which is typically presented in one paragraph only. However, it must convey a solution to the main research argument. Yet, it is not clear nor valid to the reader. In my opinion, the following points should always be featured: <b>Purpose:</b> This is where you explain 'why' you undertook this study. If you are presenting new research, explain the problem that you have solved. If you are building upon previous research, briefly explain why you felt it was important to do so. This is your opportunity to let readers know why you chose to study this topic or problem and its relevance. Let them know what your key argument or main finding is. <b>Study design/methodology/approach:</b> This is 'how' you did it. Let readers know exactly what you did to reach your results. For example, did you undertake interviews? Did you carry out an experiment in the lab? What tools, methods, protocols or datasets did you use? <b>Findings:</b> Here you can explain 'what' you found during your study, whether it answers the problem you set out to explore, and whether your hypothesis was confirmed. You need to be very clear and direct and give exact figures, rather than generalise. It's important not to exaggerate or create an expectation that your thesis won't fulfill. <b>Originality/value:</b> This is your opportunity to provide readers with an analysis of the value of your results. It's a good idea to ask colleagues whether your analysis is balanced and fair and again, it's important not to exaggerate. You can also conjecture what future research steps could be.</p> <p><b>2- Title:</b> The title is informative, relevant, and conveys the main idea. However, I would recommend changing the title to something like <i>“Political economy of greenhouse gas emissions and human security threat: An Evidence from Nigeria”</i></p> <p><b>3- References:</b> The references are relevant, yet outdated, only 33% of the reference list is from the last five years. When submitting a paper in 2022 it is expected to have up-to-date references. Moreover, the author should have used a free reference manager like Endnote or Mendeley for the in-text citation. In general, the full list of references and in-text citations must be revised to make sure that they are indexed in respected databases such as WoS and/or Scopus.</p> <p><b>Introduction/ Literature review:</b> The research introduction is missing. <b>Elements that should be covered in the Introduction:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State the research problem (purpose of the study).</li> <li>○ State the aims of the study. The following is a list of questions: Is there a problem? Why is does it exist? Why does it need to be solved? Who will benefit from the study? In what sense will they benefit? How will it contribute to what is already known? An important part of introduction is where you state the proposal objectives. (After addressing the above questions).</li> <li>○ Provide the context and set the stage for the research question and show its necessity and importance.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, the author needs to include one more paragraph at the end of the introduction section; the outline paragraph, for example: “The rest of the study is organized as follows. The next section presents the literature on the ....., followed by the methodology used. Section four reports the main empirical results, and section five of the article draws conclusions and provides elements for consideration .....”</p> <p>In addition, the literature review is insufficient and is out of date, yet, too brief and needs to be rewritten in the format of an argument. Nevertheless, the researcher/s needs to give much stronger evidence of the originality of their paper by elaborating more on the literature gap related to this point at the end of the literature review section. However, the conceptual framework is clear.</p> <p><b>Methods/ Results and Discussion:</b> Concerning the methodology, it is more to a report rather than a methodology with model specification (Unacceptable).</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion and recommendation section is insufficient. The author needs to extend the section by adding the policy implications related to the study results, limitations (if any), and stating some future research	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mostafa E. Abo Elsoud</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The British University in Egypt, Egypt</b>