



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_46355
Title of the Manuscript:	POVERTY MENACE AND HEALTH NEXUS IN NIGERIA: A BOUND TEST 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/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. c Abstract 2. Introduction 3. Literature review 4. Materials and Methods 5. Results and Discussions 6. Recommendations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author should re-write the abstract in the following order: Background (1-2 lines about context and purpose of the study); objective (1-2 lines about context and purpose of the study); Materials and methods (brief over view of complete methodology in 3-4 lines); Results (3-4 lines about the main findings of the study); Conclusion (Core outcomes in 1-2 lines only) 2. The introduction is lengthy; author should present concisely the key facts about the area of study, rationale and objective of the study as well as the significance statement. 3. Author can remove the literature review section since it is a research paper not a review paper. Tables and figures in section two can serve as appendix at the end of the manuscript. 4. The setting and specification of the ARDL model is inadequate; the author should re-write the model in its scientific form reflecting both the short-run and long-run relationships. 5. Results and Discussion" are not properly written. Author should summarize the description of all tables and provide only important, significant, main or key findings of the study and avoid over explanation which may cause confusion. Also, tables in the discussion part are not properly constructed; author should refer to standard academic tables. 6. Recommendations as presented by the author are mere direct statement with less logical consistencies 	<p>Accepted and abstract re-written as suggested</p> <p>All identified issues of problem statement, objectives and significance of the study are already in the various paragraphs of the introductory section.</p> <p>Literature Review section re-titled as also suggested by another reviewer. Again, selected tables have been removed as recommended by another reviewer since the figures depict similar information.</p> <p>Model re-written to with the incorporation of both short and long run relations as highlighted. This is well appreciated. Many thanks.</p> <p>Results and discussions summarised with the consideration of only important variables. However, since the title has been amended to incorporate social economic determinants/variables, the discussion earlier presented is considered adequate.</p> <p>Recommendations have been re-written to meet national specifics and are such more logically consistent with empirical findings in Nigeria.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appendix 2. Spelling and grammatical error (not much) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. URL/ DOI of many references are missing. Author should provide URL/DOI of all listed references to make them accessible. Also, the author cited only 16 references in the manuscript, which are insufficient for the justification of scientific research. Author should cite more references in the manuscript. 4. The bulk of figures and tables in the paper can be transferred to appendix section 5. Author should avoid grammatical and spelling mistakes 	<p>For references without DOI: DOI not activated at the time of sourcing such materials to the best of our knowledge.</p> <p>While another reviewer recommended the elimination of some tables that possess same information as the figures, we have removed those tables while the figures remain as part of the main text.</p> <p>Thanks for your professional advice. Re-checked by authors. We accept responsibilities for any other</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

			grammatical or spelling mistakes in this article.
Optional/General comments			

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	