



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_50698
Title of the Manuscript:	Aggregate Earnings and (Un)employment Rate: evidence from 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>)



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	Background of the study is too lengthy and lacks to contextualize the research problem to be studied.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract is well written. However, it would be better to avoid word redundancy (For Example, the word "also" in line 9 and 15). The author/s need to follow citation and referencing style of Sciencedomain international. The author/s need to use Times New Roman font for the whole paper. Hence, he/they need to format from line 195-198, line 207-211, and line 411-416, etc. accordingly. The literature review is adequate on all sides of theoretical and empirical evidences. In general, the methodology employed in the context of this study is elaborated clearly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → However, more clarification is needed with regard to the four criteria considered by the author/s to select 101 companies from 173 (i.e., line 398-400), a justification is required for the sectoral composition imbalance (for example, 2 companies from agriculture, 3 companies from conglomerates, etc.). → Financial Deepening is not operationally and clearly defined. The framework of analysis, in general, is clearly specified, apt and adequate. The results were clearly explained based on the evidence provided in the form of tables. 	<p>We have corrected the manuscript by considering these valuable comments</p> <p>Revision done</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Done</p>
Optional/General comments	The writing style and language used are apt for academic writing and free from serious grammatical errors that impede communication.	Grammatical errors have been removed

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	