



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7600
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REGULATORY FRAMEWORK AND FORENSIC ACCOUNTING, THE NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment <i>Forensic Accounting is an important and new issue. The author was successful in choosing this subject.</i>	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The structure of the paper is strange, there is no introduction no back ground for this study no research methodology. I recommend : 1- Introduction. "a general statement of the problem, or rather, the purpose for engaging in the study" 2- The theoretical framework is not sufficient Most of it about Nigerian regulation system. Nothing about the previous studies? Often, a literature review is conducted in a given subject area before a research question is identified 3- Research Methodology and Development of Research Hypotheses. Hypotheses should be build after reviewing 4- Bibliography is insufficient.	INCLUDED IN ABSTRACT. THIS TOPIC IS VERY CONTEMPORARY NOT MUCH PREVIOUS STUDIES HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT IN THIS REGARD. TOPIC IS NOVEL AND MORE BIBLIOGRAPHY ADDED.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Merge all the challenges in one statement no need for 5 statements.	CORRECTED