



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_50597
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Exchange Rate on Foreign Direct Investment Inflow in Nigeria
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"> The keywords should be improved by adding ARDL, and subtracting inflow to read EXCHANGE RATE, FDI., ARDL. This statement "<i>hence Depreciation of a host country's currency reduces its production cost, which is called a relative wage channel. However, the home country's currency appreciation results in an increase in the real wealth of multinational firms, known as relative wealth channel and the more the firm accumulates wealth in the host country, the more it gets opportunity to make further investments (Cambazoglu and Günes, 2016)</i>" lack consistency. It should be restructured. Figure 1 should be drawn along side exchange rate performance from 1980 to 2017. The section 2.1.1 should be deleted. The equation used in the manuscript should match. Example equation 3.3 is nowhere to be found. The results of the work are interesting but poorly presented and need to be reworked on. Recommendations 2 and 3 does not have any bearing on the findings of the study. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Done Restructured Data for exchange rate performance not sufficient Done equation 3.3 removed Results was presented alongside its discussion for ease of comprehension Recommendations 2 and 3 has been removed
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The duration of the study is different from the data range. The necessary correction should be made. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The author(s) should read through the manuscript again. Example this statement "The preliminary step of the analysis involves a determination of the time series properties of the various variables in the various models as specified in chapter three" do not tally with the work. 	

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)	