



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_44943
Title of the Manuscript:	ARE THE DETERMINANTS OF IMPORTS SIMILAR ACROSS MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS? EVIDENCE FROM 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	There was a conflicting citation of an author in the paper, the authors quoted an author with two different years in the paper, but in the references only one of the years was seen. For instance, the authors should look at their conclusion where they quoted Adewuyi (2015) and in the theoretical framework and literature review where they quoted the same author Adewuyi (2016). In the references, only Adewuyi (2016) was sighted so where is his work for 2015 in the references The authors should clarify between Adewuyi 2015 & 2016, because in the references only Adewuyi 2016 was sighted. So was there a mistake in the years? The authors should correct the mistake as observed in the conclusion, literature review, theoretical framework and references	All is Adewuyi (20116)
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There were a lot of typographical and grammatical errors, for instance, the authors were using present tense were they were supposed to use past tense, especially when they were reporting the findings and results The conclusion was too long, it can be summarized and kept simple. The authors should look at line 11, it is supposed to be electronics not electronic; they should look at Lines 19,44, 46, 130, 184, 187, 188, 189, 192, 194, 197, 207, 222, 227, 241, 257, 263, 274, 288, 318, 358, 376, 380, 423, 435, 438, 439, 441, 444, 446, 497, 503, 516, , 521, 522, 523, 527, 529, 538, 545, 547, 565, 575, 582, 587, 592, 606, 618, 623, 625, 628, 630, 633, 645, 646, 652, 653, 655, 658, 660, 665, 666, 667, 668, 671, 672, 673, 674, 680, 685, 686, 690. The authors should check these lines for typographical and grammatical errors. For instance, if they wanted to write food & beverages, i was seeing food &a beverages.	The paper has been proofread and necessary corrections done. This is shown in yellow color. The conclusion has been reviewed I have taken time to correct all typos
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	