

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_104326
Title of the Manuscript:	APPLICATION OF QUANTILE REGRESSION TO THE ROLE OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SERVICES ON CITIZEN'S STANDARD OF LIVING IN 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>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	The manuscript is important for the scientific community The title for the article is suitable The abstract of the article is comprehensive The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate The manuscript is scientifically correct The references are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The Manuscript requires serious editing	
Optional/General comments	There are many incomplete sentences. Where citations were recommended by the earlier reviewer they have not been done. The authors should write etc, it's, i.e in full or instead of etc use among others. Edit the English as many sentences are disjoint.	

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 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angela Mucece Kithinji
Department, University & Country	University of Nairobi, Kenya