

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_106589
Title of the Manuscript:	Gross Capital Formation, Infrastructure and Economic Development in Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. This article is not well written, but there are major issues that should be corrected. The title reflects the intention and topic of the article quite well. The abstract is somewhat confusing because it contains some redundancies and lacks a clear line of argumentation (problem statement, research question, placement in relevant scientific fields, methodology, key findings, contribution). Therefore, I recommend that the abstract be rewritten. The linkage between the manuscript's objective and why the research was necessary was not well established.</p> <p>The Introduction could do more to ground the paper's RQ in the debate and the related literature. In the actual version of the manuscript, scant attention is given to a theoretical derivation of the study's RQ and its actual positioning. Indeed, the lack of studies cannot be considered sufficient motivation for this study.</p> <p>My suggestion is also to fully rewrite this section in order to answer the following questions: (1) Why is this topic relevant, and what is known about it? (2) Which are the gaps you plan to address, and how do you problematize them? (3) How do you plan to close or address those gaps? (5) What are the main contributions of your study? I encourage authors to carefully consider and incorporate the suggested articles for manuscript quality improvements, justifying where necessary. I would also suggest that the authors extend their literature review regarding the field. It is not clear how this paper contributes to the existing literature. I suggest rewriting the introduction and critically analyzing the literature. The literature review is not thorough, so the reader is not given an adequate background on the topic. Although the literature is not adequately written, it offers no new information or a new slant on the topic. Most of the content in the manuscript is well known to the readers of the journal.</p> <p>Here are some recommendations: The paper is not as rich in data as it should be, and many methodological choices were made concerning that. However, it is difficult to follow and understand your method choices as they are now structured. I suggest that you start with an overview of the research process and have a section for each stage that includes discussion or subsections on your research strategy, data collection techniques, and data analysis. Although the authors have done a good job explaining the methodology, I am particularly curious to know why they chose the statistical method. What is the unit of analysis? What sampling methodology do you use?</p> <p>The discussion should be rather organized around arguments, avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature. The conclusions are overly short. The authors should include only the conclusions that originated from research and are relevant to the paper. The conclusion section requires major revision. Also, provide some future research direction in sustainability with some study limitations. I would highly suggest the authors review as many published articles as possible in the targeted journal to observe the requirements of the journal before submission.</p> <p>What implications can be derived from the results?</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>What are the limitations of this study? And what are your future research direction suggestions? The authors should also present their ideas clearly. Some of the latest references must be updated.</p> <p>The authors should review more recent articles. The prosocial condition reflected more in the background of the study than the egoistic condition. The authors should improve this aspect of the work since the study is central to the two conditions. The authors should state the study's objectives or the hypotheses in section one. And ensure it connects with the findings and discussion sections. I will suggest the authors revisit the discussion section and include an 'evaluation of hypotheses'; also, it is important to cross-reference the findings with recent literature. Also, the author should link the specific objectives with the method used to discuss how each specific objective is achieved with the method.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to read the paper. I wish them all the best in revising this paper, and I wish the authors all the best as they proceed with the article.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. No.</p> <p>4. No.</p> <p>5. Yes. Partly.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language of the paper needs to be revised and corrected all the grammatical issues.</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Nemer Badwan</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Al-Zaytoonah University of Science and Technology, Palestine</p>