

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_85307
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DOMESTIC SAVINGS AND INVESTMENTS ON NIGERIA'S ECONOMY: 1981-2020
Type of the Article	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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>First of all I would like to appreciate the author for his effort</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The author needs clearly state the `Research Gap` in the introduction part. What makes this study unique from the previous studies? 2) The author should give emphasis on the methodological part of the study. Since the study is based on time series data, he has to specify the estimation techniques: like co-integration (EG, ARDL, NARDL, VAR, VECM...), stationary tests, long-run and short run tests (ECT) and model diagnostic tests, including model specification tests. 3) Besides, the empirical model specification part is entirely missed. The author may start from the Solow or HD model and expand this by incorporating the necessary variables 4) Make sure that you've included all relevant explanatory variables. (That possibly determine your dependent variable) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The gap was shown after empirical review. We have upgraded to show the research gap also in the introduction. (2) We felt that the paper is not designed to serve as lecture note on econometrics, however, we have added value. (3) We have no intent of displaying preliminary investigations, but showing the variables as suggested in our title. (4) All variables in our model were explained. Thanks for reminding us.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Better to summarize the empirical literature review part using a table 2) Be consistent when you mention your source of Data. (eg you wrote, World Development Indicators in the Abstract part and World financial indicators (on page 15) 3) Be careful when you write policy recommendations (<i>Nigerian monetary authority should sustain the monetary policy rate between 11% and 12% and encourage savings deposit rate to be between 1.5% and 2.5%; and investment.....</i>) 4) The Abstract part should also comprise the Statement of the problem, General objective (not the specific one) and estimation techniques along others. 5) The discussion part is well presented, however, be attentive when we come to the conclusions. 6) Table 1 and 2, in the discussion part need to be rearranged so as to make them attractive and concise. I recommend you to construct a Graph for Table 1 7) Give focus when you define the instrumental words (eg.,, National income is the total value of the final output of all new goods and services produced in a country in one year—it seems as if you defined GDP) 8) Clearly list your study hypothesis in the Introduction part. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) We think it's a matter of style. If the Journal guideline so specifies, we shall summarize same in a table. (2) Thanks for the observation. (3) We feel that our recommendations should be specific not suggestive given the reality of analysed data and market environment. (4) Thanks. We have improved on that. (5) Thanks for the commendation. (6) We are not interested in the graphs because of limited pages expected, but to show the processed data for possible use of interested researcher. (7) We have attempted review to show differences between National Income and GDP. (8) We did so. We have reframed the presentation.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are a number of recent researches on this issues, you would have been discussed them and incorporate in the introduction and literature review part 2) Better to construct and include Conceptual study framework 3) When you write Sources of table: don't mention tables as a source of by themselves (Eg. Table 7 and Table 8) 4) Include the first three Digits, When you discuss about the estimated coefficients. (eg. -0.443802) 5) Don't use the same reverence here and there 6) On page 3 it says.....about ₦33.107 trillion, but what does it (the currency (₦)) mean 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Thanks. In subsequent review we shall update. (2) It is a matter of writing style; and dependent on the problem of the work. (3) The presentation in Tables 7 and 8 were extracts from the processed output data which were sourced appropriately. (4) Thanks for the suggestion. It could make the work reader friendly. (5) What is wrong in make references to same work severally? We should be mindful of not over referencing (6) ₦ is the symbol of Nigeria currency, Naira.

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)	