



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_67988
Title of the Manuscript:	An Autoregressive Distributed Lag Method for Tourism Receipts and Economic Growth in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract section The paper lacks Theoretical Underpinning Operationally measurement missing? How come the analysis were ran 2020 and the data for the study stopped in 2017. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please Kindly remove all the abbreviation in the abstract section. Not even a theory was discussed relating to the work How is the variable operationally measured? There must be a mistake somewhere as regards the time frame and if not, I suggest the author's should update the analysis aspect with recent data as there are UpToDate data on chosen variables. <p>Yes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No theoretical review; every model is built around a theory(s) not even one was discussed. Taking a close look at the modelling how was Tourists Arrival measure? If you claim all other variables were measure in monetary terms then there is need to be more specific as to how it is operationally defined same goes with Receipts for Passengers Transport items and Receipts for Passengers Travel items. Kindly ensure that comment (2) is taken into consideration and if there might be any adjustment, kindly run another analysis to be on a safe side and remove any variable that might be contradicting in the model. Note. Only after you must have linked the variables used with theories. Inconsistency in Referencing style INCONSISTENCY as regards reference style and year of publication e.g. World Travel and Tourism Council (2015) Was referenced and you cited 2017 in the paper <p>Please kindly follow the reference below as a guide take note of places colored: Aremu, A. B. & Lawal, L. O. (2018). Tourism development and sustainable economic development: Evidence from South Western Nigeria, <i>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</i>, 2(1), 1-9.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Table 1 The time series data was from 1992 and 2017 and the analysis was done 2020. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TAR at first difference value missing. Kindly provide evidence and reasons for not using up to date data. As it is believed that every research, most especially time series should be up to date, stopping at 2017 looks too old, several activities must have taken place on or before then that will be captured in the data. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Rerunning /Redoing the data analysis aspect Please kingly consider reviewing all you reference 	<p>Reviewer's comment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Doing this will add to up to date knowledge on the subject matter even thou the changes might not be that feasible as it should. Refer to persons not properly referenced is another kind of plagiarism please take note. <p>7. IRRELEVANT REFERENCES (below represents authors that were referenced but not cited in the work)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Balaguer, J. and Cantavella-Jorda, M. (2002) Dritsakis, N. (2004) Anionwu, C. and Anayo, D. N. (2019). Erick L. (2011). Falade, J. B. (2003). Ivanov, S. and Webster, C. (2013). 	<p>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>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>7. Seetanah, B. (2011)</p> <p>4. MISSING REFERENCES (cited but missing)</p> <p>1. Okon (2014)</p> <p>2. Solow (1956)</p> <p>3. Çağlayan, Sak and karymshakov (2011)</p> <p>4. Central Bank of Nigeria Statistical Bulletin (2016)</p>	
--	---	--

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:	Abina Adedigba. Praise
Department, University & Country	Ignatius Ajuru University Of Education, Nigeria