

Paper: “Theoretical Review of the Impact of Fiscal Deficits on Economic Growth in Nigeria”

Submitted: 05 June 2020

Accepted: 04 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Bushi Kasimu Musa

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p310](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n1p310)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Caren M.B. Angima
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 2: John Gathiaka
University of Nairobi, Kenya

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ESJ 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.

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

Reviewer Name: Caren M.B. Angima	Email:
University/Country: University of Nairobi-Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 2 July, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 3 July, 2020
Manuscript Title: Theoretical Review of the Impact of Fiscal Policy Variables on Economic Growth In Nigeria.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0676/20	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>The only</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Proof read. There is reference to Pakistan somewhere instead of Nigeria	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Methodology section seems misplaced and should ideally come before the results. The relevant objective is only the first one. The others listed can come under importance or value of the study or be done away with.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	4
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Objectives need to be re looked at and numbering of the sections needs attention.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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: ESJ 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.

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

Reviewer Name: John Gathiaka	Email:
University/Country: University of Nairobi, Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 1-7-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 6-7-2020
Manuscript Title: THEORETICAL REVIEW OF THE IMPACT OF FISCAL POLICY VARIABLES ON ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 76-06-2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

The paper's main focus is on fiscal deficits. The title should therefore be, "THEORETICAL REVIEW OF THE IMPACT OF FISCAL DEFICITS ON ECONOMIC GROWTH IN NIGERIA".	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract is silent on results	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper needs some editing.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> There are some errors that needs to be cleared.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion could be enriched with findings from analysis of the data presented in the tables in main body of the paper.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Specific comments can be found in track mode in the attached paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: None.