



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_34441
Title of the Manuscript:	COST CONTROL MEASURES AND FUNDS MANAGEMENT IN TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN NIGERIA: AN IMPACT ANALYSIS
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>(We have provided more support for the hypothesis, however, the reviewer provided no evidence to prove that the model is inconsistent with the hypotheses (it is wrong for a reviewer to just make such a statement without explaining how, such conclusion could appear to be prejudicial.) Merely saying that something is not correct is hanging. However, we have decided it is better to take away the model specification. Correlation analysis was not the only thing done to arrive at the conclusion as can be seen in the study, however, we have corrected that impression on the abstract.)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Hypotheses are formulated without any support of existing literature. This is not scientific and acceptable in social science research. The expression of equation (model of the study) is totally inconsistent with the stated hypotheses. Hypotheses, model, and analysis of the study is not correct. Correlation analysis of independent variables is not sufficient to conclude the study. Regression analysis is not consistent with hypotheses.	The corrections as highlighted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		