SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEMT_46746**
Title of the Manuscript:	**National Open Apprenticeship Scheme and Youth Employment in Bwari Area Council, Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria.**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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	**Let me start by appreciating the opportunity accorded to examine this paper. I do not take it the opportunity lightly.** **Having said that, my comments concerning the paper are presented below:** **1. The topic should read The Impact of National Open Apprenticeship Scheme on Youth Employment in Bwari Area Council.** **2. The introduction is loaded with irrelevancies and should be re-written. Create the situation of youth unemployment in Nigeria, its negative implications and measures to reduce its escalation.** **3. Present studies conducted on this topic and bring out the gaps in knowledge that will lead to your research questions and hypotheses.** **4. As it were, your hypotheses do not have serious backing in the literature.** **5. One and half page is okay here. There is no need of telling stories.** **6. In respect of the literature review there is a lot to be done. Subheadings in that section should be youth unemployment in Nigeria, Causes of youth unemployment, Negative Implications, National Open Apprenticeship Scheme** **7. The methodology was not properly done. For instance, the study design was not indicated. What is the population in figure? What sample did you take? How did you take it? What inform the choice of chi-square? Because it is not a good instrument for measuring relationships between variables. What are your indicators? Which is dependent and independent variable? And many others.** **The paper should be re-written.**	2. Your view on the introduction is devoid of the expertise expected from an expert reviewer. It diverges completely from the views expressed by other expert reviewers that reviewed this manuscript. Based on this, your view lacks professionalism, objectivity and was borne out of sentiment. All the things expected in the introduction are in it. 3. The literature review section of this manuscript addressed your views. The last paragraph of that literature review addressed the gaps in the literature. Based on these gaps, the statement of the problem, research questions, objectives and hypotheses resulted. 4. Your assertion is wrong. See point 3. 5. Another subjective view expressed. 6. Once again, the views expressed here are based on your sentiments and lacks the professionalism and expertise expected from an expert reviewer. 7. Once again, I will assume that you did not read the methodology. Reviewing of article should be based on facts and not subjectivity. My advice is that you should check the meaning of study design, figure, sample and read the various sampling techniques and revisit the methodology of this study. Chi-square was used because it is a non-parametric statistics that make no assumption about population distribution. They are easy to use and applicable to few samples. They can be applied to nominal data. Our scale of measurement was nominal. It does not quantify but merely labels or classifies objects. Based on the last two sentences, dependent and independent variables are ruled out.
Minor REVISION comments	The type of article was not indicated.	It is an original research paper.
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)*	