



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_27712
Title of the Manuscript:	THE DETERMINANTS OF DOMESTIC PRIVATE SAVINGS 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>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Under the background of the study, some of the issues discussed are less relevant and others are not backed by source - The variables entertained in the model are rather obvious factors that are measures of the something again and again. The author better includes some other variables with theoretical backing. - Domestic saving and real interest rate are stationary at level. With stationary services, co integration may not be the appropriate technique to check the significance of the relationship with the intended dependant variables.	(1).The background of the study has been reviewed and required source of information included as suggested. (2) The observation is noted and will be considered in subsequent study on the subject. The variables used in this study for is reasonable in achieving the objective of this study. (3)We are sorry to note that our analyst wrongly reported the stationarity of domestic savings and this has now been corrected and attached as appendix for your perusal. On real interest rate, we substituted it with nominal interest rate which is stationary at first difference. Our reason is based on our believe that most savings decision depends on nominal interest rate rather than real interest rate which many savers are not privy to. our revised regression result is also attached for proper clarification.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Just the general objective is enough in the abstract. - In the abstract again, it would suffice if you only indicate which variables are significantly related and which are not; ne need to talk about the elasticity of the different factors - Again in the abstract, only the main recommendation	All issues raised in the abstract has been duly addressed as suggested. All issues raised in the abstract has been addressed and nominal values in the background revisited as suggested by another reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	would be enough. The recommendations listed are more generic, lacking practicability. • The nominal values reported under the background of the study section are not important	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author better includes some other variables with theoretical backing.	This we hope to do in our further study on the subject.