

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_100303
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DISAGGREGATED IMPACT OF FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MONETARY POLICY IN NIGERIA
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. The study of disaggregated impact of financial development on the effectiveness of monetary policy in Nigeria is an interesting topic. The methodology used for the study is appropriate. The conclusion is also attractive like financial market development is the most effective component of financial development in enhancing the outcome of monetary policy and recommended that while designing the policies government and Central bank of Nigeria together should frame the policies.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of article is comprehensive</p> <p>4. The Researcher has to write the Need of the Study and Objectives of the Study separately.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references given by the researcher are sufficient, but not shown under separate heading.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author has to expand Q1 The author has to expand Q2 The author has to expand IMF</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nagamani K N
Department, University & Country	Government First Grade College, India