



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. 	
Optional/General comments	The writing style and language used are apt for academic writing and free from serious grammatical errors that impede communication.	



[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:	Kibrom Kahsu Hailu
Department, University & Country	Raya University, Ethiopia