

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127799
Title of the Manuscript:	TRADE OPENNESS AND NON-OIL TAX REVENUE IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	

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>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article examines how trade openness influences Nigerian non-oil fiscal revenues over the period 1986-2022. This is a topic of great importance given that Nigeria relies heavily on oil revenues, which make up a significant proportion of its public revenues and exports. This dependence makes the country vulnerable to oil price fluctuations and other external risks. To diversify the economy and reduce this vulnerability, trade openness and the stimulation of non-oil tax revenues are essential. For the scientific community, this theme addresses crucial issues linked to economic diversification, fiscal stability, public policy and sustainable development. By analyzing the specific case of Nigeria, the study of trade openness and non-oil tax revenues would provide a better understanding of the economic dynamics influencing the growth and diversification of the Nigerian economy. Moreover, Nigeria's experience in these areas can serve as a model for other countries facing similar challenges, offering researchers comparative perspectives on best practices in economic diversification.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The theme of "trade openness and non-oil tax revenues in Nigeria" is particularly appropriate, as it deals with two major economic challenges: diversifying the economy and finding new sources of revenue for a country heavily dependent on oil.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acronyms used in the summary should be spelled out, as they appear for the first time in the document. - The effect of the variable "trade openness" on the variable "non-oil tax revenues" mentioned in the summary is a source of confusion. According to the document, it reads: "mom". - The sentence "Post-estimation results" could be deleted. Indeed, the results of post-estimation tests are not essential here, as they are not robustness results but rather illustrate the adaptability of the data to the estimated model. <p>The recommendation should be completed by also addressing the aspect of openness to trade.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript has several weaknesses, both in form and content:</p> <p>Form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of plan announcement: The introduction to the work does not end with a clear presentation of the paper's plan, which is usually expected in a scientific work. - Inconsistency in the style of references: The style of citing authors varies throughout the manuscript. For example, we find "Egwakhe, Akinlabi and Odunsi (2018)" in the introduction, while in the literature review we read "Egwakhe et al. (2018)". - Poor structuring of the methodology: The methodological section starts awkwardly by listing the variables and their sources. As a general rule, the presentation of the analysis model and its specification should be followed by the introduction of the data and their sources. - Cited works are not referenced: e.g. Agyei and Amankwaah (2018). <p>Substance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Empirical review: The empirical review is largely off topic and does not sufficiently take into account the main aspects of an empirical review. It would be preferable to focus on the most significant articles, directly related to the research question, and produced in various geographical contexts (countries). As a reminder, an empirical review should clarify the current state of knowledge in a specific field, offering a critical assessment of existing methods and results, while identifying grey areas or unexplored aspects. In this manuscript, the last paragraph of the empirical review mentions "this study", whereas these elements have not been explored in advance to justify such a conclusion. - Inconsistent methodological approach: The methodological approach suffers from several inconsistencies. The ARDL model used has had no solid inspiration, it is vaguely stated, and no explanation is given as to how the variables are measured. As a general rule, a methodological approach is inspired by previous work where the authors have adopted or initiated a similar approach. Furthermore, the presentation of the equations (3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) is inadequate. As the ARDL model is dynamic, the lagged variable of the dependent variable should be included among the explanatory variables, which is not the case in this manuscript (equations 3.1 and 3.2). Furthermore, equation 3.3 of the ARDL model is poorly formulated. Inspiration from the work of Chudik and Pesaran (2015) could help correct this formulation. - Incompleteness of results: The last sentence of section 4.2 is incomplete. - Omission of the optimal ARDL model: Before performing the Bound cointegration test, it is necessary to determine the optimal ARDL model, i.e. the optimal lags of the series. This step seems to have been omitted in this work. - Table 5 incomplete: Table 5 does not present the results of a long-term dynamic relationship, as evidenced by the absence of the error coefficient (ECM). This corroborates the methodological problems of the ARDL model mentioned above. - Absence of short-term results: Estimation results for the short-term relationship are absent. - Biased interpretation and discussion: In view of the above observations, the results and their discussion are biased. It is essential that estimates, results and their discussion are properly presented and analyzed in a research work. However, in this manuscript, these elements are largely insufficient. - Absence of CUSUM and CUSUMSQ stability tests: These tests are essential for a dynamic model such as ARDL in time series, but they are missing from this analysis. - Conclusion too weak: The conclusion is insufficient and fails to adequately summarize the subject matter. - Inappropriate recommendations: Given the biased results of the analysis, the recommendations made seem disconnected from the conclusions of the work. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Insufficient references (barely a page and a half), especially recent ones</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A linguistic revision is desirable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research topic is relevant, but suffers from a lack of in-depth documentation and does not seem to fully meet expectations. A complete revision of the manuscript would be necessary to obtain more interesting results.</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>Avlekete Avogbe Didier</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Abomey-Calavi, Benin</p>