Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPAS_86009**
Title of the Manuscript:	**IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF GAP ON NIGERIAN CRUDE OIL PRODUCTION: A BOX-TIAO INTERVENTION 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:

(https://www.journalajpas.com/index.php/AJPAS/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	First of all, the topic of this study is very critical and beneficial for local development, even though the results are not significant at all. At least, it tries its best to recall people's attention for the topic. But there are still some problems which need to be revised. 1.the bad typography in the 1. introduction and 2. review of literature, which makes me face difficulties in reading this article. 2. In 6. Conclusion part, I think the results are should be concluded as "Results of the estimated model revealed that there is not any statistically significant evidence which show the amnesty programme had impact on crude oil production". By the way, the possible reasons are not that enough to support the insignificant results, and I think this is what the author should work on. 3. In the 7. recommendations part, even though the author(s) provide some suggestions, but I think it is not that enough, which the author should talk in depth, in order to make readers understanding the importance of the recommendations.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. I don't know what format your references are, I really suggest you can follow this journal requires or some popular format like APA. 2. Figure 5 is a screenshot from some places (probably from the work of author(s)), but it is not processed well, especially the border of the figure.	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Bing He**
Department, University & Country	**Jiangsu Ocean University, China**