

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_95798
Title of the Manuscript:	SURVIVAL STRATEGIES FOR NIGERIAN YOUTHS
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)
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Its contribution is more to policy makers and practitioners than to the scientific community 2. I prefer if more reviews of literature are incorporated. Literature is lacking to make it conceptual review. 3. The abstract is comprehensive and well written. 4. The manuscript is brief and subsections are of course appropriate. 5. Actually, the methodology is not clear. I advise the authors to review more articles and apply systematic literature review as a methodology to keep the scientific nature of the article. 6. References are insufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality is acceptable.	
Optional/General comments	I recommend major revision. To strengthen the manuscript with additional literature and more references	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abebe Alemu
Department, University & Country	National University of Science and Technology, Oman

Review Form 1.7