

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_106682
Title of the Manuscript:	Human Capital Development and Economic Growth: Evidence from Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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> <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>The abstract lacks precision as the author tends to explain more about the background and problem, not the manuscript as a whole. Please summarise the methods, methodology, instrument, analysis, and findings in the abstract section to give a glance at what the readers would expect in the study.</p> <p>Some of the structure and subsections are inappropriate as there are missing numbers of subsections and alignment. It is suggested that the author separate the 2.1 theoretical framework into separate Sections.</p> <p>In research methodology, please describe the study's methodology, what method does the author use for the study? How would the data be gathered? What instrument the data would be collected and analysed? Sampling size and scope of the study.</p> <p>The paper is scientific in regard to the data presentation, but it is not appropriate as it is not complete to be considered a scientific article as it has many parts missing to be presented as an article. Please put the readers that have zero knowledge as part of the target audience, where the explanation needs to be easy to understand and complete.</p> <p>The author has provided findings but there is no discussion presented in the manuscript. Please do a critical analysis of the findings and discuss the author's opinion on what the result indicates as part of the discussion. Make suggestions and proper recommendations in the discussion for each data finding that has been presented. (Put section 6 as part of the findings. Let the conclusion be the last section)</p> <p>There is no hypothesis suggested in the early stage but suddenly appear a hypothesis statement in the last part of the manuscript. Please indicate what are the hypotheses at the early stage and then the author can provide a conclusion of that particular hypothesis.</p> <p>The references are acceptable but please indicate each citation to each statement in the articles properly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The Language is acceptable	
<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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Fauzan Abu Bakar
Department, University & Country	College of Creative Arts, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia