

REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "FISCAL POLICY TRANSMISSION CHANNELS AND MACROECONOMIC VARIABLES PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA"

Corresponding Author: Jolayemi Lydia Bose

Email: akanbibose76@gmail.com

Doi: 10.19044/elp.v8no2a11

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Bashar H. Malkawi

University of Arizona, USA

Published: 30.06.2021



ELP Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ELP promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ELP editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ELP out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted: May 8, 2021
Manuscript Title: FISCAL POLICY TRANSMISSION CHANNELS AND MACROECONOMIC VARIABLES PERFORMANCE IN NIGERIA	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	



Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The title reflects in a clear manner the content of the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Yes</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The paper needs to be double checked for some language issues.</i>	

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Yes, the economic analysis is very sound</i>	



5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>See the comment above</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>Yes, the conclusion section is accurate and reflect the analysis put forward by the author</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Yes, the references are even too much especially in the literature review.</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	



Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Over the years, the pursuance of the macroeconomic objectives of price stabilization, full employment, the balance of payment and economic growth had raised pertinent issues on the roles of macroeconomic policies and its transmission in both developed and developing economies alike. Does this apply to Nigeria also?

It is a good thing that the author mentioned in the literature review of the paper linear and non-linear models.

Some of the paragraphs are quite long. These need to be broken into two paragraphs.

The methodology used by the author is clear and supported by sound econometric analysis.

This paper investigated fiscal policy channels and macroeconomic variables **performance** in Nigeria using Bayesian approach of Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium model. This is a very important statement.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

