



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_45084
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimal Policy Mix for Inclusive Growth: Evidence from Nigeria
Type of the Article	1. Original research paper

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	(i) The researcher should add the Aim of the research and the objectives of the research under section 1 (Introduction) to guide readers of the manuscript on the objectives that the researcher wants to achieve. These section should be numbered 1.2 and the objectives should be in line with the research questions found at the end of section 1. (ii) Instead of naming section 3.1 Data, the researcher should call it research design as it was alluded that the research design is a case study.	(i) 'Objectives of the Study' has been provided in sub-section 1.2 in compliance with the reviewer's instruction. Howbeit, I did not consider it necessary to make this inclusion. (ii) The sub-heading, "Data" has been replaced with the suggested sub-heading, 'Research Design'. I agree wholly with the reviewer that this change is necessary.
Minor REVISION comments	The researcher may consider to include the period under study in the topic i.e. Evidence from Nigeria (1980-2016) In line 618, the researcher should correct the word "Modal" to "Model".	"Modal" is a terminology which is closely associated with factor analysis and is quite different from the word, "Model".
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well balanced especially in terms of academic writing and data presentation. However, one of the first recommendation sounds as it did not come from the primary data source i.e. maybe it is a suggestion from employees from the Central Bank of Nigeria or from the Ministry of Finance. If that is the case, the researcher was expected to include the study population, sample size and sampling procedures used in the methodology.	



PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
	No	Noted