

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_116085
Title of the Manuscript:	UNDERSTANDING THE NIGERIAN DOMESTIC DEBT
Type of the Article	

[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? 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 article "Understanding Nigeria's Domestic Debt" is an attempt to provide an overview of the state of domestic debt in Nigeria, identify the key problems associated with its growth and suggest possible solutions. The authors examine the structure of public debt, dividing it into domestic and external debt, and focus on the current increase in domestic debt in Nigeria, which they argue poses a threat to the country's economic stability.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IMRAD structure appropriateness: The first notable shortcoming of the paper is the departure from the traditional IMRAD structure (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion), which compromises its organisation and logical presentation. The Introduction seems to be too concise and does not fully describe the scope of the problem, while the section on research methods is absent or not explicitly stated, which creates problems in understanding how exactly the authors arrived at their results. The sections related to the results and their discussion merge, reducing the clarity of the argumentation and evaluation of the proposed solutions. 2. Depth of analysis: The authors emphasise the current challenges associated with the growth of domestic debt in Nigeria, but the analysis presented seems superficial. The lack of detailed analysis of the debt structure, its origins and drivers of growth noticeably limits the understanding of the nature of the problem. Although the article mentions the consequences of debt growth such as debt overhang and crowding out of the private sector, there is no analytical dissection of these processes and their impact on the Nigerian economy. 3. Criticism of the use of sources: The paper seems to rely on publicly available data and opinions but does not include reference to academic studies or detailed analyses of the data. This limits the academic significance of the paper and its ability to offer verifiable conclusions or recommendations. The lack of a comprehensive discussion of alternative views of the problem misses an opportunity for a deeper understanding of the subject matter. The paper does not use sources from the last five years, which raises doubts about the validity of the results of the literature analysis. 4. Suggestion of solutions: The creation of a separate public debt management, similar to the DMO, is presented as one possible solution. However, the arguments in favour of this approach seem insufficiently substantiated because the potential risks and complexities of its implementation are not assessed. Moreover, there is no discussion of alternative debt management measures and their potential impact on the country's economy. 5. Overall level of scientificity: Overall, the article fails to achieve a high level of scientificity, which is a result of the lack of a rigorous structure, lack of depth of analytical review, use of a limited number of sources and insufficient argumentation of the proposed solutions. A more thorough investigation of the problem using a variety of methodologies, as well as a broader engagement with academic literature, is needed to increase the scientific significance. <p>In conclusion, although the article focuses attention on the pertinent problem of rising domestic debt in Nigeria, its scholarly potential and ability to offer convincing solutions is limited due to the above shortcomings. It is recommended that a more in-depth study of the problem, centred on addressing the identified shortcomings, be undertaken to enhance the academic relevance of the paper.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Kurpayanidi K.I.
Department, University & Country	Fergana Polytechnic Institute, Uzbekistan