

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJ SSE_121695</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MACROECONOMIC DRIVERS OF BANKING INDUSTRY STABILITY IN NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This research paper is somewhat relevant with the Nigerian Economy regarding what are the drivers to banking industry. This paper can suggest some suggestions for policy makers of Nigerian Economy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Could have been added ' Scope for future research'	
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.	The manuscript is somewhat correct only requires fewer modifications. Data provided in the paper are relevant and these secondary data are relevant.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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:	Sushil Kumar Pradhan
Department, University & Country	Centurion University of Technology and Management, India