

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Original Manuscript_JEMT_117752</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CORPORATE PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA: INSIGHTS FROM ECONOMIC-SPECIFIC SHOCKS</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The research is of importance to the scientific community as it focuses on scientific inquiry, addressing the inherent complexities and challenges in achieving accurate and reliable scientific knowledge. The discussion on the nature of scientific errors, whether arising from honest mistakes or misconduct, and the self-correcting nature of science, provides insights into the scientific progress.</li> <li>2. The title of the article, "Scientific Principles and Research Practices," is suitable as it accurately reflects the manuscript's content, which encompasses a broad overview of the foundational principles and practices of scientific research.</li> <li>3. The abstract summarizes the key points addressed in the manuscript, including the discussion on the nature of scientific errors, the concept of science as a self-correcting process, and the importance of ethical research practices.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript, as inferred from the content provided, seem appropriate for the subject matter. The manuscript appears to be organized in a manner that logically progresses from discussing the individual character of scientific fields, through the nature of scientific errors and the self-correcting nature of science, to the implications of research practices on scientific progress.</li> <li>5. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It discusses established concepts within the scientific community, such as the self-correcting nature of science and the importance of ethical research practices. These discussions are grounded in the broader context of scientific inquiry and reflect a deep understanding of the subject matter.</li> <li>6. The references provided in the search results seem to be sufficient for the topics discussed in the manuscript. However, the references and citations do not match and the citations are not formatted correctly. Please check all references and citations via Recite works to fix the numerous citation/referencing issues. , it is difficult to assess their recency and comprehensiveness fully.</li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language and quality of English in the provided excerpts are suitable for scholarly communications. There are several grammar errors (semi colons which should be colons, incorrect spacing, using that instead of which (and vice versa) etc. Please run through Grammarly or a similar grammar/spelling/word choice program.</li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Once the writing/formatting is cleaned up, I recommend it for publication.</p> <p>Minor review for spelling/grammar/word choice, APA formatting</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jan Tucker</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Business, UMGC, USA</b>