SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEMT_47199**
Title of the Manuscript:	**How Distortionary are Oil price shocks to Consumer prices? Empirical evidence from Nigeria using dynamic co-integration Models**
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)

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	**Review of the Manuscripts Ms_JEMT_47199, How Distortionary are Oil price shocks to Consumer prices? Empirical evidence from Nigeria using dynamic co-integration Models " for the Journal of Economics, Management and Trade .** **The paper „ How Distortionary are Oil price shocks to Consumer prices? Empirical evidence from Nigeria using dynamic co-integration Models" intends examines the response of consumer prices to the oil price shocks in Nigeria.** **In abstract it is necessary to present the aims, study design, methodology, and conclusion without titles.** **Introduction section is too short. It would be very useful extend this section and to add the novelty, the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research. Also the authors have to explain shortly the structure of the paper. It is necessary to extend the conclusions.** **The results of the research presented in the paper are valuable and should be presented to the scientific audience in this journal. The paper can be published in Journal of Economics, Management and Trade, after minor changes.**	1. We have removed the tittles in the abstract of the revised version of the manuscript. 2. We have included the purpose, objective, and hypothesis in the revised manuscript highlighted in yellow colour in second page, first paragraph. 3. We already explained how the paper is structured in the last paragraph of the section 1. 4. We have extended the conclusion highlighted in yellow colour in paragraphs 4 and 5 in page 11 of the revised manuscript.. 5. The authors are willing to present the paper in any scholarly conference if we are sponsored.
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	Based on our knowledge, we do not observe any ethic issues in this manuscript.