

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_78868
Title of the Manuscript:	ARIMA-GARCH MODELING OF MONTHLY CRUDE OIL PRICES VOLATILITY FROM 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:

(<https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Congratulations to the author(s) for their paper. The paper explores the effects of crude oil prices volatility in Nigeria on the performance of the revenue from crude oil sale in future. The topic of the manuscript is very relevant and in line with the aims and scope of the journal which makes this manuscript interesting. However, I have some minor concerns that need to be addressed. I'll explain them in the order of importance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Tables are structural forms with rows and columns. For this reason, shape and table separation should be done well.2) The novel contribution of the manuscript shall be made clear in the introduction. What does the paper adds to international literature?3) General statements shall be removed.4) The adopted methodology shall be described. All methods used, assumptions made shall be justified.5) Conclusions shall be specific and connected to your analysis of previous sections.6) The English are very weak. There is a need for English Editing.7) In my opinion, the policy recommendations do not have justification in the empirical results.8) Please clearly highlight the literature gap this study tries to fill in.9) It should be explained more clearly why these years are especially preferred. (2010-2021)10) Why the method used was chosen. You explained in the conclusion but it should be explained in detail before conclusion. How this method is essential to address limitations in this area? Please justify on why ARIMA-GARCH modeling is the most appropriate method for examining the selected thematic.11) And lastly, the writing needs to better. Although there are not a lot of obvious mistakes, the style is clunky and I advise that the manuscript is proffered by a native English speaker.	

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:	Mustafa Göktuğ KAYA
Department, University & Country	KTO Karatay University, Turkey