

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_99501
Title of the Manuscript:	Households and 1-World economy: A mathematical discourse
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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>It is. It has the introduction, literature review methodology, findings and conclusion.</p> <p><b>It is suitable, but each word should be capitalized. "Households and 1-World Economy: A Mathematical Discourse"</b></p> <p><b>The abstract attempted to answer the what, why, but no clear statement of how the why was achieved.</b></p> <p><b>Needs improvement. The methodology, findings and discussions must be scientifically discussed.</b></p> <p><b>With the manner the sections were laid out, I think it is scientifically fair. However, the author may be advised to caption the methodology, Findings and discussion, and include recommendation(s).</b></p> <p><b>I think it sufficient for the length of the article... 15 references. Guerriero (2015) is however missing in the list and was cited by the author.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The author should avoid long sentences to make the work easier for its readers. He may need to revisit the work to fine-tune some grey areas.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rufus Sunday Olojuolawe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bamidele Olumilua University of Education, Science and Technology, Nigeria</b>