

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_77142
Title of the Manuscript:	On Exports and Capital Formation in Nigeria
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper has some merit, however, the following issues have to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is misleading and should be restructured to align with the objective of the study. 2. Abstract should follow the paper template. All the abbreviations should be written in full the first time they appear. 3. The introduction does not capture all the relevant areas required. The background of the study, the problem of the study and the justification for the study were not well established in the introduction. The objective of the study is not well conscripted. The objective should be able to present a prospect for solving the research problem(s). The scope of this study should be clearly defined owing to the fact that the study is only focusing on a narrow aspect of the larger economy. 4. Some section of the introduction need to be moved to the literature review. 5. Some information (claims) need to be supported with references. 6. The literature review section is insufficient. The author has demonstrated the ability to synthesize the existing body of knowledge, but there are significant gaps. The research gap has not been well defined. The literature need to be robust and updated with current literature. 7. The methodology is shallow and ominous. It does not have strong methodological footing needed for this kind of analysis. Econometric methodological procedures need to be clear and explicit so that the process can be replicated. Why should a particular method be chosen over the other? What is the implication of the process in the overall result? Hence, the methodology section needs further elaboration. 8. The result of the was generically presented and does not point towards solving any particular problem. The discussion of research findings is skeletal and lacks detail analysis of the results. The results need to be properly interpreted to reflect the exact information and meaning they intended to portray. The author should also validate any research findings against the existing research study. Otherwise, the originality of the study is questionable. 9. The conclusion should show how the study has addressed the identified research problems, the implications of the study to the Nigerian society, and the benefits of the study. The limitation of the study should also be clearly stated and must be tied to the scope as presented in the introduction section. 10. The referencing should be properly cross-checked for correctness and completeness. The author should adhere to one referencing style, preferably, the one specified in the paper template. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper would benefit from extensive editing, including syntax, grammar and referencing before publication. 2. Thorough editing will be needed including cross-checking all information in the tables before being accepted for publication. 3. The author should adhere to either American or British English and not the combination of the two. 4. The author should comply with the general paper template. 	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The paper seems to have good prospect if all the issues raised are adequately addressed.2. The author should be meticulous while revising the paper so as to not to miss the desired scholarship ingredient required in the paper.3. The paper can be accepted for publication if all the issues raised are adequately addressed.	
---------------------------	--	--

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:	Peter Uchenna Okoye
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria