

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_103032</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Income Inequality on Poverty Level in Nigeria: Evidence from ARDL Model</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>Needs adjustment.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p> <p>Needs adjustment.</p> <p>Needs adjustment.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Needs adjustment.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The article addresses a relevant and current theme, which is the relationship between income inequality and poverty, especially in a development context like Nigeria. However, there are some aspects that need to be corrected to make the article suitable for publication.</p> <p>The article has several problems with wording, formatting, and citation, which compromise the clarity and credibility of the paper. The article contains grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors, uses ambiguous or imprecise terms, does not follow a consistent pattern of bibliographical references, and does not indicate the sources of the information presented.</p> <p>It also fails to comprehensively review the literature on the topic, ignoring relevant studies that address the relationship between income inequality and poverty in other African countries or in other regions of the world. It also does not discuss the theoretical and policy implications of its findings, nor does it suggest areas for future research.</p> <p>The paper does not conduct a sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of the results to different model specifications or to different measures of inequality and poverty.</p> <p>More pointedly, the abstract does not summarize the main results found. Likewise, the introduction does not make clear the contribution of the article to the literature and how the article is structured. There is also no justification for the choice of the analysis period.</p> <p>The source of the data in the tables is wrong. The data are not from the research, they are secondary data, so the original source of the data should be indicated.</p> <p>There are problems in typing the equations. A proper equation editor should be used. In the methodology it is stated that the analysis period is from 1981 to 2021, which is not corroborated in the results section.</p> <p>In the description of the data in the descriptive table there is no need to use so many decimal places, one could standardize two. A recurring problem is the error in the source of the data in the tables, as well as the fact that they appear before they have been commented on.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>Table 2 and 4 need adjustments. They are misconfigured, making it difficult for the reader. There is not even a comment on table 4, which has a lot of information. If table 5 synthesizes the results, put table 4 in the annex. There is a misunderstanding in the interpretation of table 5, unless it was estimated in a functional form different from what is explicit in the methodology.</p> <p>Ransey's test does not allow for the conclusion found.</p> <p>There is a problem with the non-identification of causality between the variables. This may indicate that the model is not correctly specified, which puts the results in suspicion. It may be a problem of important variables omitted. The exclusion of variables. Or the incorrect specification of the model, that is, the specification of the ARDL model may not be adequate to capture the long-run relationships between the variables. For example, the improper choice of lags or the incorrect functional form of the equations may lead to inaccurate results and a lack of identified causality.</p> <p>Thus, the conclusions are suspect. I recommend reviewing the model specification more thoroughly to ensure that the lack of causality between variables is corrected, making it possible to reach conclusions with confidence.</p>	
--	--	--

**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>Wellington Ribeiro Justo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cariri Regional University, Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil</b>