

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEFM_1807
Title of the Manuscript:	BUDGET DEFICIT, BUDGET REFORM AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it presents novel findings that contribute to the advancement of knowledge in its respective field. By offering new insights, methodologies, or data, it helps to address existing gaps and fosters further research and exploration. Moreover, the manuscript acts as an important resource for scholars, helping to spread essential information that can guide future research, applications, and innovations. Its publication also fosters collaboration and conversation within the scientific community, advancing shared knowledge and progress.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- To add more references (for empirical literature review) which include recent publications to enhance the manuscript's depth and credibility.- Need to check the in-text citation again- Should use table 1 instead of chart 1 at the beginning of table 1 interpretation- Should check the references list to format properly	Done
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but a few grammar mistakes	Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It emphasizes the manuscript's strengths, including the novelty of the research, the robustness of the methodology, and the clarity of its presentation. The article's overall structure and organization are well-crafted. However, it would be beneficial to expand the literature review to incorporate more recent or relevant references.	Done

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>	