



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_5991
Title of the Manuscript:	Unemployment and Crime in Nigeria: A Panel Data Analysis
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Section 4: policy implications are not connected with the literature used, recommendations are too far from academic analysis. The author is too much implied on solutions which are not given by the analysis conducted and the literature used. The section should be called Discussions and not implications. The contribution of the author fits more with politic issues than academic discussions. Conclusions: are not sufficiently linked to the results of the study. L300 provides argument out of the findings of the model. Policy recommendations are not provided according to the model built and the main results found.	These are provided in section2 The policy implication were drawn from the findings of the study which came out of the regressions ran Argument in L 300 is based on the finding that inmate population has significant positive effect on crime instead of negative predicted in the literature.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author should say I am building a model for political science issues not economic literature advancement. The main revisions to do come from section 1 in the presentation of the analysis, data should be introduced to evaluate the problem both in absolute and relative terms to highlight more the gravity of the situation and the need of this kind of study in academic debate. Policy recommendations should be connected more to the analysis results. Policy should be neglected for academic findings first. L75-79 should be erased L14-15 should be introduced in conclusion only The literature results should be more precisely given (L55-L56) The scientific contribution should be academic first and not politics after The literature provided insists more on crime than on unemployment which is not provided. The connection between unemployment and crime is done only in regard of crime literature not with unemployment models which should be given too and the connection among the both key variables is not well done. There are some English grammatical mistakes in the paper	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The model has a scientific part and a politic part but both of them are not closely linked. Results should lead to conclusions, arguments given for policy recommendations are not provided by the analysis. The extensions of the analysis are thus too great and leave the model's aim and results far away from the academic discussions.	