

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127929
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF PUBLIC DEBT ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA (2000 – 2023)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To address the concerns and improve the study, the objective should be reshaped to emerge logically from the research gap identified in the literature review. I'll also walk through how to frame a research hypothesis, evaluate the existing literature based on the importance of the study, and highlight what's new from each piece of research.</p> <p>Restating the Objective:</p> <p>To reshape the objective effectively, it's important to present it as a response to gaps in the existing literature on public debt and economic development. The objective should arise naturally after identifying what existing studies have missed or underexplored. Given that the article focuses on Nigeria's public debt and economic development as a measure of development, but used HDI as proxy of Economic development. Substantiate the matter</p> <p><i>That specific research gaps or unresolved questions in the existing literature on public debt and economic development does this study aim to address, and how does the focus on HDI instead of GDP provide a more comprehensive view of development?</i></p> <p>Framing the Hypothesis:</p> <p>The study currently has test hypotheses (null hypotheses), but to transform them into research hypotheses, they need to explicitly state the expected outcomes based on theoretical reasoning or previous studies.</p> <p>Literature Review:</p> <p>A systematic literature review should be organized by identifying what's new from each study and grouping studies that produce similar results. How can the existing literature on public debt's impact on economic growth or development be structured to reveal what is new or unexplored in this study, and how can studies with similar findings be grouped to clarify patterns in the research?</p> <p>By clubbing these studies together, the argument can be made that debt due to stringent conditions, could have a stifling effect on human development. This strengthens the rationale behind the hypothesis that multilateral debt has an impact on economic development.</p> <p><i>To improve the study, the objective must emerge from a clear identification of research gaps, the hypotheses should clearly state expected outcomes, and the literature review should be structured to highlight the significance of the study. Using HDI instead of GDP further enhances the study's contribution to the understanding of how different types of debt affect human development in Nigeria. But, The study lacks conceptual clarity and coherence in its writing style, making it difficult to follow the logical progression of the argument. Additionally, while multiple regression and related robustness checks are mentioned, are they appropriately justified and applied within the context of the research?</i></p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Shamna Thacha Paramban</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>India</p>