



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_24432
Title of the Manuscript:	Prospects of Nigeria's ICT Infrastructure for E-Commerce and Cashless Economy
Type of the Article	Policy Paper

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 <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Nil The study is good and well-structured even the title of the paper.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: Line 7: information and communication technology (ICT) would have been Information and Communication Technology. Suggestion: The period under which study is being carried out should appear in the abstract. Introduction: Line 57: There is need to revisit the line. Suggestion: By the CBN and not the Nigeria's CBN. Line 103: suggestion: The government of Nigeria has since sustained..... Line 111-112: Constant use of full stop should be avoided. Line 130 -131: The use of daily full stop should be minimized. Suggestion: the largest proportion of the ICT industry, followed by the device sales and distribution while the equipment sales..... Line 158: Suggestion: The word 'adopting' would have been 'adoption' Line 166: An omission of 'and' such as technology and computer.	Correction effected Done Done Done The entire sentences have been reworked. Done Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 167: The phrase 'all of which' should go out. Suggestion: Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore have adopted..... Line 219: There was an omission (revisit) Suggestion: ICT infrastructure in Nigeria with a view 'of'..... Line 109 – 110: The study was primarily for the period of 2000 – 2012, why the Table 2. Suggestion: Please revisit line 217 and Table in line 109 and 110. Line 223: The numbering of the heading should be revisited (lines 223,224,232,253,278, and 287) Line 255: The 'source' for the information from line 254 should be provided. Line 266: The 'source' for the information from line 265 should be provided. Line 274: In the table from year 2010 – 2012, 'Comas' ought to be placed in the right place for easy understanding of the figures. Line 301: Suggestion: There is need to replace one of the 'that' with 'there'. Line 343 and 345: After the surnames, the initial capitals should be used instead of the full names before the years.	There was not any omission. It had been reframed. Done The data for periods 2013 and 2014 had been removed. These had been addressed. Done Done Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		