

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJEBA_117971
Title of the Manuscript:	MICROCREDIT AS A STRATEGY FOR NIGERIA'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY IN POST COVID-19 PANDEMIC ERA: NIGERIA'S BANKS PERSPECTIVE.
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 (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? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>This topic is impressive to research but the methodology used is extremely poor and unacceptable to the scientific community. The title is good "MICROCREDIT AS A STRATEGY FOR NIGERIA'S ECONOMIC RECOVERY IN POST COVID-19 PANDEMIC ERA: NIGERIA'S BANKS PERSPECTIVE." The last part of the title "NIGERIA'S BANKS PERSPECTIVE" is not necessary</p> <p>Abstract is acceptable. It summarizes the content properly.</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p>Entirely misleading wrong conclusions owing to poor econometrics knowledge and wrong applications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) $BRGDP = \beta_0 + \beta_i [(MFL)]_t + \mu_t$ the model is subject to omitted variable bias due to omission of very relevant explanatory variables (2) OLS cannot be just applied to time series data without testing data stationarity (I0) by ADF test or any other test. Applying OLS with nonstationary time series data will produce spurious regression results (3) Number of observations are just 10, cannot be accepted for an OLS regression analysis of any kind (4) Impact of Microfinance on Economic growth cannot asses by using Annual data from 2012-2021 only 2 data points represent after COVID era. (Use quarterly data with lag effects) (5) Contribution of microfinance will not have instantaneous effect but a lag effect on economic growth. To capture that you need a sufficient number of observations to have reasonable lag length (quarterly data) (6) Durbin-Watson stat= 0.931217 shows higher degree of Autocorrelation without solving which you cannot estimate correct slope coefficients (7) With Durbin-Watson stat= 0.931217 and very high R square value, shows spurious regression useless interpreting results (8) The spurious results obtained with just 10 observations and wrong time series analysis by no means give any statistical inference about population parameters <p>References acceptable</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>Language is scientific and acceptable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Recommend to re do the analysis part Using quarterly data With first difference and relevant lag terms</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:	Nandasiri Keembiyahetti
Department, University & Country	University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka