



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_4098
Title of the Manuscript:	OIL PRICE SHOCK, EXCHANGE RATE MISALIGNMENT AND DOMESTIC INVESTMENT IN NIGERIA: A SYNTHESIS EXAMINATION
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The authors may shorten the paper by merging the conclusion section, summary of findings and recommendation. The abstract section should be more comprehensive. Possible asymmetric behaviours in oil market are not mentioned. I suggest authors to use asymmetric VAR models to capture those behaviours. There are some critics to the regular VARs for the oil market. See the papers on the subject. The scales of the figures such as figure 1 should be improved. Since the graph does not give much information. There are some other issues in the text such as openness. The authors may narrow the subject. Reorganize the table 2. The table is provided just as a copy of Eviews print. The VAR outputs of the Eviews are given directly at the end of the paper which is not usual in academic papers. Overall, based on the comments above, I suggest to not publishing this paper in this form.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer