



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	<p>Let me start by appreciating the opportunity accorded to examine this paper. I do not take it the opportunity lightly.</p> <p>Having said that, my comments concerning the paper are presented below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>The paper should be re-written.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The type of article was not indicated.</p>	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Dare Ojo Omonijo
Department, University & Country	Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria