Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEFM_1798
Title of the Manuscript:	TIME SERIES MODELING OF MONTHLY AVERAGE EXCHANGE RATE OF NIGERIAN- NAIRA AND UNITED STATES-DOLLAR
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Modelling Monthly Exchange Rates: Nigerian Naira vs US Dollar Using ARIMA	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 3(07-07-2024)

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.

The abstract is fairly informative and encapsulates the key features of the study. Nonetheless, there are some areas where it could be enhanced for better clarity and completeness. Here are my comments and suggestions:

The abstract states clearly the objective of the study, which is to model and forecast the monthly average exchange rate between the Nigerian Naira and the US Dollar. It gives a summary of the methodology used, which includes the application of the ARIMA model, and the procedures followed to make the series stationary. The abstract clearly states the source of data, which is the Central Bank of Nigeria, and the period, 2003 to 2024, thus giving the study credibility. It states that the most parsimonious ARIMA (8,1,2) was chosen and appropriate for forecasting.

The abstract could be much more concise in that it might eliminate some repetitive phrases and concentrate only on the most important points. For instance, the sentence "The reason for this paper was mainly to model the monthly average exchange rate of the Nigerian - Naira and the United States - Dollar and to forecast the future exchange rate in 2025" can be reduced. The abstract has selected the ARIMA model, but a very brief statement about the key results and their implications would be good. For example, what does the predicted exchange rate tell the Nigerian economy? Some implications of the findings of the study, how the policymakers or the economists could apply the projected exchange rates to be determined.

Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.

Introduction & Review of Literature

Certain sentences are very long and complicated and hence hard to understand. Some of them can be divided into more than one simple sentence for easy readability. The sentence that starts with "There was a significant volatility." should be divided into two or more sentences. There are a few grammatical errors and punctuation issues. To give a simple example, "Nigeria is characterized with a mixed exchanged rate system" should read "Nigeria is characterized by a mixed exchange rate.

The introduction is good on many counts, but the flow between sentences and paragraphs could be smoother. Use transitional phrases to connect ideas and make the argument more logical. The introduction talks about "economic and political events" without elaborating what those events are, except for the 2014 oil crash. Specific examples would strengthen the argument. It is good to have a detailed introduction about why the study needs to be undertaken, but perhaps the research gap should be expressed more clearly about what gap does this study need to fill among the existing ones.

Materials and Methods

Certain parts of the methodology are very wordy; they should be made brief. An example in this respect is how the components of the ARIMA model can be defined briefly, which may help without losing any core information. Including diagrams or flowcharts could help explain complex concepts and processes. For example, a flowchart showing the steps of the Box-Jenkins methodology could help in better understanding. This paper mentions that the assumptions of the ARIMA model are considered. However, it would have been helpful if it had addressed how these assumptions were tested and validated in this study, then, more confidence would be put into the robustness of the model. The methodological note that ARIMA(8,1,2) was chosen because it is a most parsimonious model, but further reason should be cited on why that model was considered over the other models and why it performs in comparison to them.

Result and Discussions

Parts of the results and discussions contain too much detail. For example, the discussion of the time plot and correlogram may be summarized to dwell only on important findings. Although the manuscript is well detailed, a deeper interpretation of the results could be done. For example, it would be interesting to discuss the economic implications of the forecasted exchange rates and how they might impact policy decisions. The manuscript mentions the comparison of the ARIMA (8,1,2) model with other tentative models but does not provide detailed insights into why the chosen model outperformed the others. Including a brief comparison of the performance metrics of the different models would strengthen the discussion. The discussion section could be enriched by mentioning the limitations of the study and areas for future research. For instance, it would have been better to have discussed the impact of external shocks or structural breaks on the model's accuracy. The summary of key findings from the results section will make it more concise and focused. It would also highlight the most

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 3(07-07-2024)

	important points and their implications. Economic Implications: An interpretation of the results discussing their economic implications, potential impact on policy decisions. This is to ensure that readers comprehend the deeper meaning of the findings. A detailed comparison of the performance metrics of the different models considered should be provided to clearly justify why the ARIMA (8,1,2) model has been selected. The limitations of the study should be acknowledged and areas for future research identified. This will give a balanced view and suggest avenues for further investigation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you	Although the references include recent studies, there are also some older references (e.g., from 2010,	
have suggestions of additional references, please	2011, 2014). Although these are still relevant, ensuring a balance between recent and older studies	
mention them in the review form.	can provide a more comprehensive view of the current state of research. Including two or three recent studies in the last two to three years would greatly enhance the literature review. This would update	
	your study with the latest trends and findings of research.	
	your study man are taken and and manings or resource.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are a few grammatical errors and punctuation issues that need attention. Some sentences are very long and convoluted and may be hard to follow. Breaking them down into shorter and more concise sentences may enhance its readibility. Like breaking up the long sentence, which begins as "There was a significant volatility.", into two or more sentence. Ensure that the terms and formatting are consistent throughout the manuscript. For example, the term "exchange rate" should be used consistently without any variations. Transitional phrases can be used to enhance the flow between sentences and paragraphs. This will help guide the reader through the argument more smoothly. A final proofread is advisable to catch any remaining errors and improve the overall quality of the language.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vicente E. Montano
Department, University & Country	University of Mindanao, Philippines

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 3(07-07-2024)