



## SDI Review Form 1.6

v

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_51196
Title of the Manuscript:	PRINCIPAL COMPONENT ANALYSIS OF NIGERIAN ECONOMY FROM 2006 – 2017
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Generally, the manuscript is not well organised. It characterised by poor literature, objective of the study, mismatch of the conclusion and the abstract.</p> <p>The document lacks its clarity on the specific objectives; the Principal Component Analysis covers almost the document, left the gaps on the economic structure in Nigeria. For example, the literature reviewed by the author is about the principal component analysis, which is the method. This is due to poor research problem (weak establishment of the research problems that lead to poor objective of the study).</p> <p>The discussion and conclusion is not originated from the literature reviewed.</p> <p>Suggestion :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improve the literature- to covers the research problem/improve your research problem</li> <li>2. Improve the objective of the study –in relation to your research problem</li> <li>3. Improve the discussion and conclusion-to links both your findings and the literature reviewed</li> <li>4. Improve the methodology-to answer your research problem</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript have been totally re-organized, with adequate literature, objectives and correct conclusions and abstract</li> <li>2. I have reviewed seven literatures in this study, (see section 2)</li> <li>3. I have improved the objectives of the study (see section 1)</li> <li>4. I have improved the discussion and conclusion, also there is a link between my objectives and the reviewed literatures.</li> <li>5. The methodology was improved</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	NIL	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NIL	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

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