



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Effect of Gross Domestic Product and Exchange Rate on Rice Export Promotion and Competitiveness in Nigeria: 2000-2023”

Submitted: 10 April 2025

Accepted: 17 June 2026

Published: 30 June 2026

Corresponding Author: Rabi Shuaib

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n16p138

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Hamzo Khan Tagar

College Education Department Government of Sindh, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Uchenna Okefi

North Carolina A&T State University, USA

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

EFFECT OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT AND EXCHANGE RATE ON RICE EXPORT
PROMOTION AND COMPETITIVENESS IN NIGERIA: 2000 - 2023
The title is acceptable

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

It's clear and accordingly

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Nice in all and well written

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methods are appropriate

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results are best

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion should be considered as the best policy recommendation for the public and private sector

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Its according to the standards of the policy

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Government /private sector will be beneficial if it implements the suggestions in letter and spirit

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear.
However, the author should write out the GDP in full and include the abbreviation in parentheses in the first sentence of the abstract.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract presented the objectives, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There appear to be grammatical errors, improper spacing, inaccurate punctuation, sentence fragments, and various spelling mistakes that need to be adjusted. For example, it is Autoregressive and not "Autoregressive". It is the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), not "Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)", etc.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the methods are clear.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

The results do not contain errors; however, it is somewhat clear.

The authors noted that some coefficients were significant at $P > 10\%$. However, a $P > 10\%$ is generally not considered statistically significant. A P value of this threshold ($P > 10\%$) is considered weak and implies insufficient evidence for a real effect.

The results section needs thorough vetting to assess the significance of most of the variables, coefficients, and findings.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The concluding chapter is clear.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes. However, more recent peer-reviewed articles need to be cited/referenced.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
