



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_67239
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Domestic Investment, Export Expansion and Economic Performance in Nigeria: A Vector Autoregression Approach
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction should supplement the main content of the research, the data used and the results of the research. 2. Before Empirical Analysis, Result and Discussion, there should be a part to introduce the variable selection and data sources used in this article. 3. Please add realistic explanations of the empirical results. The current explanation is only an intuitive description of the results, which is not enough for the research content. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introductory section of the article has been modified to the data used for the analysis, the findings and how it relates with the theoretical foundation of the study. 2. All variables have been described and their sources clearly stated in the "Methodology" Section of the manuscript. 3. The current interpretation and explanation of empirical results has been adjusted to reflect the opinion of the reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For "The contribution of this study..." the second point would be better if give a more detailed explanation. 2. 3 or 4 decimal places for the value can make the table content clearer and more beautiful. 3. The table format needs to be more standardized. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The second point in terms of the contribution to knowledge has robustly explained to provide more details in line with the reviewer's suggestion.
Optional/General comments		

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)	