

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_99135
Title of the Manuscript:	Oil Wealth and Economic Growth in Nigeria: Empirical Analysis 1990 – 2021
Type of the Article	previous announcement

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)	The article presents an idea, plan or proposal that uses applicable facts and principles from the course that address a development need Title of the article is suitable Project demonstrates student has a good or basic understanding of the key concepts, principles and theoretical frameworks of the concepts presented in the article The project contains convincing facts and/or statistics for the idea, plan or proposal, and is referenced with one or more credible source(s) A somewhat strong case is made for the position taken, though some doubts remain. Presents a mostly clear argument for or against statement. Some details and segments may be tangential or confusing.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language used is effective to some degree. Word choice is good but inconsistent. There are few grammatical errors.	
Optional/General 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:	Saudin Terzic
Department, University & Country	UNIVERSITY VITEZ, Bosnia and Herzegovina