

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_119389
Title of the Manuscript:	Digitalisation, Banking Stability and Nigeria's Economic Growth Trajectory
Type of the Article	

### 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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>i. The manuscript looks good for the scientific community especially in the context of Nigeria.</p> <p>ii. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>iii. The Abstract is well written but looks lengthy (more than 250 words), it depends on the choice of the Journal's words limit.</p> <p>iv. The subsections are well placed.</p> <p>v. While analysing the methodology and empirical results, I'd like to add that most of the parameters are not statistically significant (even at 10% level of significance). Consequently, the whole crux of the study got low strength in terms of Econometric Methodology and Results. If the results are not statistically significant, how can author explain the economic phenomena.</p> <p>I would rather suggest the author to revise his methodology, may be he/ she can add some control variables to get more precise and significant results, likewise, he/ she can also use Granger Causality or Auto Regressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) approach.</p> <p>vi. The references are appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Grammar checking is suggested.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The author should revise his methodology to get the significant results.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Muhammad Meraj
Department, University & Country	Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Pakistan