Manuscript: **"Assessment Of The Effect Of Socio-Economic Infrasturcture On Rural Economy In Kaduna State, Nigeria"**

Corresponding Author: Zakaree S. Saheed

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Dr. Shaijumon C.S., Indian Institute of Space Science and Technology, India

Reviewer 2: Noor Alam, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ *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: 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: Dr. Shaijumon C S	
University/Country: Indian Institute of Space Science and Technology, India	
Date Manuscript Received:12/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/02/2021
Manuscript Title: ASSESSING THE EFFECT OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFRASTURCTURES ON RURAL ECONOMY IN KADUNA STATE, NIGERIA.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: **0276/21**	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes/No Yes You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:Yes/No 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.

Questions	*Rating Result* [Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	**2**
Needed restructuring of the title	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	**3**
Please rewrite the introduction with more clarity	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
There are many grammatical errors and mistakes. Language presentation is very poor.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	**1**
1. There is no explanation regarding how the variables chosen from Palei (2015) is useful in constructing a rural economy model 2. No mention about how the values of RN, EL, MT, TCN are arrived at. How did you estimate RN, EL, MT, TCN and global competitiveness? 3. Data values are not given in the paper	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	**2**
Could not say because of the reasons in the previous column	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	**2**
In the present form it is true.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	**1**
Inadequate references.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

1. There is no explanation regarding how the variables chosen from Palei (2015) is useful in constructing a rural economy model
2. English language has to be improved.
3. There is no reference cited how a national level model is useful for explaining the rural economy situations.
4. No mention about how the values of RN, EL, MT, TCN are arrived at. How did you estimate RN, EL, MT, TCN and global competitiveness?
5. Data values are not given in the paper
6. Since it is based on survey method, what are the questions asked?
7. From whom the data is collected?
8. Why the maximum values of all variables are 4?