

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_116810
Title of the Manuscript:	FISCAL DOMINANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA (1980-2020)
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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	<p>I sincerely appreciate the Reviewer's honest Review of the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The position of the Reviewer on the Title of the manuscript was not out of place, though it is more of encouraging scientific work. I agree with him/her, but a little update on the work would have been necessary to fit in with the topic.2. I agree with him/her on the literature review.3. I also agree with him/her on the description of the Research Methodology.4. I agree with his review and comment on the appropriateness of research tools in the empirical analysis of the work.5. I agree with Reviewer's remarks on the conclusion of the study.6. I agree with his/her words that "Suggestions and implications which he found after the study is appropriate and justifying the data received."7. "Overall, the manuscript is technically sound." I cannot agree more with this. <p>I personally appreciate the excellent review of the manuscript. I will one day celebrate the Reviewer on the achievement of milestone in scientific research.</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 Yes	
Optional/General comments	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Review Comments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. The title of the paper is quite appropriate with the work done by the researcher.9. Did good work in reviewing the literature.10. Research Methodology is very well described.11. The Research tools used by the researcher are good enough to get the analysis of the work.12. Concluding remarks given by researcher is also relevant as per the study done.13. Suggestions and implications which he found after the study is appropriate and justifying the data received.14. Overall, the manuscript is technically sound.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	