



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_40177
Title of the Manuscript:	UNRAVELLING THE IMPACT OF MACROECONOMIC FUNDAMENTALS ON STOCK MARKET PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA: AN ARDL-BOUND TESTING APPROACH
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>)

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	- In the abstract, state the objectives before the findings - The recommendations appear general. Be more specific. Provide example of what you mean by stronger regulatory framework. Give examples of policies that relates to economic growth.	- As noted by the reviewer, the manuscript have been restructured by stating the study's objective first, followed by the findings, data sources and estimation technique. - The recommendation have been provided to be more specific as it relates with the findings of the study, and the examples of such policies that can sharpen economic growth have been provided. - We really appreciate the effort of the reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	- In line 68- 70, arrange authors alphabetically. - In line 124- 125, cite some of the examples of other environmental factors not captured by Gunu and Idris (2009). - In line 172, arrange authors alphabetically. - In line 189, arrange authors alphabetically. - In line 199, use author's last name. - In line 247, change "Fama in 1970" to "Fama (1970)". - In line 260, change "Empirical Literature" to "Review of Empirical Studies". - In line 349, why the word "intuitively"? - In the discussion of findings, use common unit of measurement. For example, a certain % increase in "X" should result in certain % increase or decrease in "Y". You cannot use % for one variable and unit for another. There should be uniformity in unit of measurement for better comparison	- All minor revision comments raised have been corrected and attended to, and are duly highlighted yellow as shown on the corrected manuscript.
Optional/General comments		