

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_118241
Title of the Manuscript:	EXCHANGE RATE DEPRECIATION AND THE NIGERIA'S AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL SECTOR
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important to the economic and scientific community, since testing on sector basis provide proper indications to policymakers in relation to the tested variables.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable to the objective of the study.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, but a note in relation to that recommendation should be clear and directed to the results and the analysis of the econometric tests.</p> <p>The structure and sections of the article are appropriate, with the exception of subsections 4.2 and 4.3 are only descriptive of the results not implying any directive analysis. Subsection 4.4 provide good discussions of the results but imply a repetition and out of scope; subsection 4.4 should be merged into subsections 4.2 and 4.3, for long-run and short-run analysis, respectively. Please refer to my notes in the manuscript in results and analysis section for further remarks in relation to analysis of the results.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct and based on theoretical foundation.</p> <p>The references are relatively sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality is relatively suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Ali Ahmad El-Amin
Department, University & Country	Lebanon