



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_25589
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Socio-Demographic Variables on Electrical Energy Management Practices among Residents of Niger State, 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 <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	It is well-written and structured paper. However, there are several comments regarding this paper. Authors are recommended address following points to improve the paper. Literature Review: 1. The authors should briefly explain or discuss the electrical energy use in Nigeria. An overview of this situation is necessary to explain and educate the reader on the situation of electrical energy use in Nigeria. Some useful statistics or figures would be better to attach for supporting the electrical energy use in residential in the country 2. Any specific reasons of conduct this relationship between social-demographic and electrical energy use in Nigeria? 3. The main contribution or significant of this study to the body of knowledge should highlighted clearly. Methodology: 1. Line 135 and line 141 is redundant. 2. The authors explained the sample for this study consisted of 1290 heads of households, but the results shown that only reported 987	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	heads of households. Any reasons for this? 3. In term of monthly income distributions, the authors classified the income level into low, medium and high income, how do you grouped that? By what kind of basis? Results: 1. The authors are advised to display Post-Hoc (Tukey HSD) results in Table form. Discussion, Conclusion 1. The findings in discussion are totally different to the conclusion. 1.1 In discussion session, the authors reported the younger heads have potential to be more likely to save electrical usage (line 266), whereas in conclusion, the authors concluded that young adult wasted electricity more (line 300). 1.2 The authors mentioned that a higher level of education is associated with lower household electrical consumption (line 284), whereas in conclusion, the authors stated the residents with highest qualification waste more of electricity (line 301). Recommendation: 1. The authors are expected to recommend few useful strategies that how's the findings could be used by the local government or other relevant parties, and also other country. But first, please state clearly who are the main respondents who waste	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	energy – low or high income? Young or old persons? References: 1. The references used are not up-to-date. At least 5 recent references are required to add.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Syahrul Nizam Kamaruzzaman
Department, University & Country	Department of Building Surveying, University of Malaya, Malaysia