

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_118630
Title of the Manuscript:	INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY, MONETARY POLICY AND BANKING SYSTEM STABILITY IN NIGERIA
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory 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.</p> <p>6. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>7. 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>This manuscript is important to the scientific community in the context of this question and examines how institutional quality (IQ) and monetary policy (MP) influence the stability of Nigerian banking system. The research employed Generalized Methods of Moments to investigate six IQ indicators as well as five MP instruments vis-à-vis the Z-Score – an indicator for banking system stability. The outcomes indicated that just corruption control index while</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract of the article gives a general synopsis of the study, including the scope of the research and the methodology, and presents the key findings well. It is very comprehensive and informative.</p> <p>The paper is organized well with the sub-sections and the structure following the logical flow in terms of the literature review, methodology, findings, and conclusion. The document is well-organized and presents the information in a clear and coherent manner.</p> <p>The scientific correctness of the manuscript is achieved by applying a sound methodology to the study, as evidenced by the use of GMM and panel data analysis in examining the impact of institutional quality and monetary policy on banking system stability. Generally, the findings are supported by the use of relevant literature and empirical evidence, which further strengthens its scientific validity.</p> <p>The references used in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent; further, the wide range of sources includes reputable journals and international organizations. However, more references regarding the specific context of Nigeria and banking system stability, and the impact of institutional quality and monetary policy, will further increase the depth and relevance of the study.</p> <p>The strong points of the paper include a comprehensive literature review, sound methodology, and coherent findings presentation. It properly covers the multi-dimensional relationship that exists between the quality of institutions, monetary policy, and banking stability in Nigeria. However, the paper has the need for more recent references relevant to the Nigerian context, and it lacks a detailed discussion of the potential implication of the findings for policy and practice.</p> <p>The methodology of the study is well-structured, using published data from reputable sources like the World Bank governance indicators databank and the Annual Statistical Bulletin of the Central Bank of Nigeria. The use of panel data analysis and the Z-Score as a proxy for banking system stability adds rigor to the research. However, a more critical review of the methodology suggests a more detailed explanation of the selection and justification of the particular IQ and MP variables used in the study. Additionally, a critical verification of all the quoted references in the paper must be done to make sure that it has accuracy and credibility.</p> <p>Overall, the paper represents a good contribution to the existing knowledge on the factors affecting banking system stability in Nigeria, but it needs some changes regarding referencing, methodology, and implications for policy and practice.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ravirajan Karunanithi
Department, University & Country	United States