

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_95439
Title of the Manuscript:	Debt Crisis and Nigerian Economy: An Assessment Of The Buhari Administration (2015-2021)
Type of the 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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 REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The topic is relevant but the manuscript need a major revision before publication. The manuscript need to follow scientific approach and clearly identify the objective of the paper as well as standard sections of a scientific publication. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract did not state the objective of the paper and needs to be rewritten in line with the suggestions in the body of the work. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript need to be reviewed. Sections on methodology and data analysis as well as results of analysis we omitted. 5. The manuscript need to be reworked. 6. The referencing is defective. Over 80% of cited works are not contained in the reference list. The referencing (both intext and reference list) do not adhere to any referencing style. It is suggested that the author looks at APA referencing manual for a guide. Additionally, the author made several categorical statements that will be hard to ascribe to him/her in the absence of referencing the source of such conclusions. It is advised that the author overhauls the manuscript and support most of the assertions with suitable references.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	yes	
<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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abiahu, Mary-Fidelis
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria