

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_90899
Title of the Manuscript:	Macroeconomic Aggregates and Oil Price Vagaries in Nigeria: An Impact Assessment
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.journalsajsse.com/index.php/SAJSSE/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The study presents failures of scientific systematization. Science tells a story in a logical, clear and objective sequence. I realize that there is a lack of scientific rigor in the presentation, because there are excesses and disorganization of content. Another fragile point in the study is the state of the art, since it is indispensable that it begins in the introduction and ends in the results and discussion. I propose that you bring more conclusions to enhance the study. In the next specific topic the failures and I present suggestions.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Introduction</b> A good introduction should include some definitions, justification, contribution of the study to science, problem and objective. The introduction does not bring this organization and does not present the elements in a logical, clear and objective sequence. This strategy would be more appropriate for the results and discussion section. I suggest taking out the excesses and transmitting to the results and discussion section, and presenting only the key elements that is needed in a good introduction. I point out this criticism because the introduction is the time to convince the reader that the idea is good and deserves investment.</p> <p><b>Methodology or Material and Method</b> Completely rearrange this section. Make it clear what you are studying, so that the reader identifies your area of study. I couldn't identify your method. After all, what is your method of study? I realized that method is of association and perhaps with interference, since two or more variables communicated with dependence relationship. Once again it makes the mistake of analyzing and discussing data (I informed you to spend this energy on the results and discussion). What is present are the specific procedures, but need to reorganize. Divide into blocks to facilitate understanding of the following form: research subject or area of study (What is studying); Intellectual Method or Strategy; Specific Procedures (Development of the study); and Data Analysis (as you analyzed? Qualitative and/or quantitative approach? How the tests occurred, etc.).</p> <p><b>Results and Analysis</b> The analysis is well performed, however, it is necessary to validate the data with citations and authors who confirm the conclusions. There is little literature for validation, and therefore it is necessary to feed the study with other conclusions that ensure the feasibility of the study.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b> This section is well elaborated and objective.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Josimar da Silva Freitas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Pará, Brazil</b>