

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	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:

(<https://www.journalajebea.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Title should be more refined. Title should be Impact of fiscal dominance on money supply: Empirical evidence from Nigeria.</p> <p>3. Abstract is not comprehensive, do not discuss results in abstract!</p> <p>4. Clearly define objective of the study.</p> <p>5. Revise sections and subsection of the study; Analysis of the study is missing.</p> <p>6. Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>7. References are not recent.</p> <p>8. Do not discuss conceptual framework and theoretical framework in literature review.</p> <p>9. Cleary describe that how do you measure economic performance.</p>	<p>1. Thanks to the Reviewer for a thorough review of the manuscript. It is a good and scientific review. I agree with the first comment on the importance of the paper for scientific community.</p> <p>2. I also agree with the second comment on the topic. I have changed the topic to: Fiscal Dominance and the Effectiveness of Monetary Authority in Nigeria (1980-2020). The paper is an extraction from a Master's Thesis; that was why the topic was broader than the objective.</p> <p>3. As we were taught and from the previous papers that I have published, the Abstract should contain the summarised results of the paper as presented. I disagree with the Reviewer here.</p> <p>4. The objective has been reviewed in the light of the new topic. I agree with this comment.</p> <p>5. By the analysis of the study, I hope you meant the results of the empirical analyses. The results can be provided upon request.</p> <p>6. Thank you for the honest feedback.</p> <p>7. References are not recent. I agree. The study's scope is 1980-2020. It is an extraction from a Master's Thesis. As a scientific paper, it pushed the frontier of knowledge and the findings are valid within the period under review. An attempt is being made to revise the paper up to 2023. The new article will feature more of recent works on the subject.</p> <p>8. The study relied on the framework of De Resende (2007). The specified methodology by the author was considered appropriate and useful for the paper; hence, its adoption. I do not have any comment against the Reviewer's comment here.</p> <p>9. The title of the paper has changed; hence, the economic performance aspect of the paper is no longer required.</p> <p>My deepest appreciation to the reviewer for the thoroughness of the review. The world awaits his/her Nobel Prize winning as s/he continues to make impact in the scientific world.</p>

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	N/A	

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)	