



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	- Result (1) under the abstract is incomplete. - Use of "had", e.g, lines 3, 102, 104 and 123 to be revised. Revise writing style. Use present continuous tense rather than past tense. - Reference MEC theory by including the year. - Justify time series period. - Rephrase line 396 (The study adopts a case).	- Effecting this correction added value to this outcome, as the optimal mix was linked directly to growth. - Line 3 is empty and so, it does not contain any word, "had." Line 102 does not contain the word, "had". However, "had" appears in Line 103. Even then, "had" as it was used here is in order since it satisfies all the rules governing the use of tenses, as in "Keynes had..." - J.M.Keynes has been properly referenced, as suggested by the reviewer. Suggestion is apt as MEC theory is traced to its original source. - Study period has been justified, as demanded by the reviewer. Certainly, this correction has reinforced the research design. - Line 397, not Line 396 has been rephrased to conform with tenses in the rest of the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	- Unsatisfactory writing style. - Research area topical. - The researcher(s) showing sound knowledge of the methodology being used.	

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) There are no ethical issues involved.	Noted