



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_46948</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Nexus between Agriculture and Unemployment in Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	Original research paper

**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>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I want to appreciate the opportunity given to me to review this work by the editor of this journal. I want to say thank you.</p> <p>Having gone through the work I have the opportunity to recommend the paper for publication because the author has done a good job.</p> <p>However, he or she may need to correct the following observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hypotheses of the study derived from the literature review should be clearly stated.</li> <li>2. It could be a good idea to present the organisation of the work in the last paragraph of the introduction</li> <li>3. The methodology is okay but I am worried about the recommendations. The number of recommendations presented is more than the number of findings. If there are three findings, three recommendations should be presented</li> </ol>	<p>Response to the Reviewer's comments has been made in the revised manuscript. Most of the comments were editorial in nature and they have been attended to. Aside the Reviewer's comments, some other editorials were carried out in the revised version of the manuscript.</p> <p>In addition, the following corrections have been effected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hypotheses have been clearly stated in section 3.0 of the revised manuscript</li> <li>2. The organisation of the work is now presented in the last paragraph of section 1.0 i.e the introduction.</li> <li>3. The recommendations, which are now in section 7.0 of the revised manuscript, have been collapse into two.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	