

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_107400</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Export Diversification on Economic Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)</b>
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>** (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. The Sub Saharan Africa is a vast geographical area for research studies.</li> <li>2. The title of the article is suitable. The title is very compact with only eleven words.</li> <li>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. <i>With about 270 words, since it is less than 300 words, though the standard is 250 words, the abstract is also compact.</i></li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate only that the full objectives of the study, the research hypotheses should be revisited. Limitations to the study should also be discussed</li> <li>5. The manuscript presentations may be assumed to be orally correct. The scientific correctness cannot be proved by the reviewer. Despite the impressive data sources, the main CONTENTION in this section is the absence of the actual data used for these analyses. It is impossible for reviewer to substantiate the claimed outputs. This is a serious ethical issue on consideration. The onus is on the author[s] whether the results are scientifically correct or are co-managed.</li> <li>6. The references are sufficient and recent. Out of the 22 references 12 are between 2015 and 2020, we have 2011 and 2012 and 8 references for 2006 and below. The APA referencing style should be used consistently. The author[s] should acquaint himself/themselves with the 7<sup>th</sup> edition of the APA Publication Manual operative since 2020</li> </ol> <p><b>**Please refer to the manuscript for valuable section by section comments.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. Some sentences are corrected, punctuation marks corrected where necessary, some wrongly typed words are corrected by the reviewer.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The improvement to the study has undoubtedly added value to the study</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adebayo Gabriel Adebayo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Higher Institution for Private Practice, Nigeria</b>