

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJEBA_ 115866
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF INCREASING PUBLIC DEBT ON AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT IN NIGERIA (1981-2022)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The research article "effect of public debt on agricultural output in Nigeria" explore many issues which is related to scientific community so it is important</p> <p>title of the article is suitable and delete the period (1981-2022)</p> <p>article is good</p> <p>appropriate</p> <p>in my opinion manuscript follow the scientifically methods</p> <p>the all refernces mentioned in subsections and structure of manuscript is not covered under references heading so please cover it. i have commented the same on review paper</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Yes. It is important for the research scientific community because it followed the due process of carrying out research and its findings can be applied to the society.2. I agree that the tile of the article is suitable, but wish to disagree with the reviewer to delete the period. The period of study and data collected and analyzed was from 1981 to 2022 and the result findings and interpretation were based on that period.3. Yes, I agree that the abstract is comprehensive and gives a quick summary of the article.4. Yes, I agree with the reviewer that the subsections and structure followed the laid down format.5. Corrected and done. All references cited have been covered under references section.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>yes it is good is easy to read for scholarly communications</p>	<p>Yes, I agree with the reviewer.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>manuscript can be accept with minor corrections</p>	<p>Corrected and done.</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)	