

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_120897
Title of the Manuscript:	Nigeria's Relations with the European Union: An Analysis of the Economic Partnership Agreement
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The authors provide a critical analysis of the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) between Nigeria and the EU, a subject at the heart of debates in African countries. In dealing with this subject, the authors highlight the need for African countries to take an in-depth look at the issues involved in the economic and trade partnerships they sign. The results suggest that the authorities must ensure that future relations between the EU and Nigeria promote mutual growth without compromising Nigeria's autonomy.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of this article is suitable</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is complete and comprehensive. It is presented in 207 words (less than 250 words, the maximum recommended by many journals).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript as a whole is well structured. However, the section 2 "STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM" may not be numbered. If applicable, section 2 will be titled "METHODOLOGY"</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The authors used an analysis approach similar to meta-analysis. This approach is often used to make a synthetic analysis of existing research on a subject in order to guide future studies and decision-making. However, the authors need to give more detail on the approach used and the procedure for gathering the information.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>I have no objection to the references provided.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I did not identify a problem with the quality of the language used in this article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors have done a good job. However, the paper could be improved. The authors have not provided any literature on the theory of comparative advantage (David Ricardo), the theory of absolute advantage (Adam Smith), the Heckscher-Ohlin-Samuelson (HOS) theory, which explains international trade by differences in countries' factor endowments, and the new theories of international trade. Where possible, the authors should improve the paper by adding to the literature on international trade theory.</p> <p>I also recommend that the authors present some statistics on the products exported and imported by Nigeria under the Economic Partnership Agreement with the EU and provide criticism on the influence of Nigeria's imports from the EU on the development of local industry. Furthermore, several African countries, including Nigeria, have ratified the African Continental Free Trade Area Agreement (AfCFTA) in recent years. The authors can analyse the influence of Nigeria's entry into this economic zone on its trade with the EU.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lawin Laïfoya Moïse
Department, University & Country	Benin