



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30438
Title of the Manuscript:	An Evaluation of Domestic Gas Utilization on the Nigerian Economy
Type of the 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	Just by looking at the manuscript, one can easily conclude that that there are many tables and relatively less textual explanation following those tables. For example (and just to name few), the table regarding descriptive statistics in not explained. The same is with the majority of tables in the manuscript. Likewise, the author did not mention which unit root test is used... This is important since there exists a whole bunch of tests, one better than the other. Not to mention the introduction of dummy variables into the analysis to take into consideration (possible) break in the series in the year 2008 (2009). Breakpoint test should than be employed... Even though results are given, mostly (and only) in tables, a standalone chapter regarding policy implications (regarding the given results of the econometric analysis) is missing in the manuscript. This is highly important! Somewhat is mentioned in the conclusion but this is not the way to emphasize the results of the causality analysis! Regarding the above-mentioned conclusion, it needs to be longer. If the author has even seen the used literature mentioned in the chapter entitled Literature review, than he/she should get a basic idea how to formulate his/hers results into a good and easily readable manuscript.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Right now, this does not look like a solid scientific paper. The basic idea is good, energy economics is a rather interesting field, the novelty issues is not a problem. The way in which the paper is structured is however a (big) problem in this manuscript.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Pavle Jakovac</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Faculty of Economics, University of Rijeka, Croatia</i>