

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127030
Title of the Manuscript:	Determinants of Human Development Index (HDI): A Regression Analysis of Economic and Social Indicators
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The choice of the title for this manuscript makes the work relevant, especially to the developing and emerging economies where there is strong desire to achieve economic growth that is pro-poor. Also the author's ability to capture the main components of human capital development in his model estimation is quite commendable. It is also quite appreciative that more recent works in the area of the study were referenced but not cited by the author. However, the author failed to mention the scope of the study in terms of the period of the data collected	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	There is a vital part of Abstract writing that is missing from the author's abstract. He failed to mention the research design and the estimation technique for achieving the results of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript needs to be worked upon. While section two must do a little bit of literature review in order to show the author's understanding of the subject, his current section two could be merged to his section three to be titled methodology. This would provide the opportunity to present the study's research design and model estimation technique. Sections four and five could be merged together to form a new section four that is titled <i>Result and Discussion</i> . Section five should be Discussions, while limitations will be a subsection under section five.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is found to scientifically correct because it employed empirical research design for the study. The choice of Ordinary Least Squares for the analysis of date and the study's model estimation needs to be reviewed by the author. The choice ought to have emanated for the unit root test for all the variables of study. Note that if the OLS is used inappropriately, it may lead to a spurious result of the regression analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are sufficient and up to date. However, majority of the references are not cited in the body of the manuscript. Only four (4) of the forty-three references were cited, all in page 8 of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. But there is a need for a grammatical editing.	
Optional/General comments	A major overhaul of the manuscript is recommended in line with the corrections suggested in this review.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fashanu Felix Adeniyi
Department, University & Country	McPherson University, Nigeria