

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_116810</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>FISCAL DOMINANCE AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA (1980-2020)</b>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b><u>Review Comments:</u></b></p> <p>1. The title of the paper is quite appropriate with the work done by the researcher.</p> <p>2. Did good work in reviewing the literature.</p> <p>3. Research Methodology is very well described.</p> <p>4. The Research tools used by the researcher are good enough to get the analysis of the work.</p> <p>5. Concluding remarks given by researcher is also relevant as per the study done.</p> <p>6. Suggestions and implications which he found after the study is appropriate and justifying the data received.</p> <p>7. Overall, the manuscript is technically sound.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sarika Makol
Department, University & Country	Barkatullah University, India