



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJSSSE_54499
Title of the Manuscript:	CONDUIT MENTALITY AND THE ECONOMY: THE NIGERIAN EXPERIENCE
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

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>In the abstract of the paper, authors point out that “conduit mentality” is proxed by annual values of aggregate illicit funds. Such a proxy can be difficult to measure. Official and reliable statistics of such illicit funds will be difficult to come by.</p> <p>The proxies of the economy do not include any measure associated with GDP. Such a measure should be included. Education and Health related proxies can be indicators of socio-economic development but one GDP measure should be included.</p> <p>My other observations on the paper are listed below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The statement “national cake” should be shared instead of being “baked” --- this statement is not clear. 2. Is the definition of corruption by Peter (1978) in page 2 measureable? 3. Corruption theories of Adefulu(2007) and Iyanda(2012) are not clear? 4. Section 2 should be put in an appendix at the end of the paper. 5. The paper should be organized as introduction, literature review, methodology and data sources, estimation and analysis and conclusion. 6. Paper included in the literature review section in page 3 are not elaborate. Authors need to discuss purpose of the paper, models, sample size, and main conclusions of each paper they include in discussion. 7. Why is the reciprocal of the transparency index (CPI) showing Aggregate Illicit Fund (ILF). Does any of the other studies use this method. 8. Operational measure of variables should be taken in appendix. 9. Table 1 in bottom of page 4 should be taken in appendix. 10. Gross domestic product does not show all of standard of living. Distribution of income among the population also has a big impact on standard of living. Some people may have too little income, where is other may have too much. 11. Sample period is 1996 to 2018 and source is the World Bank. This should be put in discussion of the paper. 12. The literature review does not present papers that show that ILF is inversely related with EDU, STL and HLT. Such papers should be included in the paper. 13. For ADL stationary tests – test of lag selection and functional form should be conducted before the ADL regressions are run. 14. ARDL Bond Co-integration models functional form needs to be discusses. Authors can put an equation here and identify the important parameters. 15. Equations for Table 5 to 10 should be discussed in the paper. It is difficult to summarize from the Tables alone. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>16. Table 5 to 10 should be formatted Now they just show raw-output from E-Views.</p> <p>17. Discussions on Table 5 and 10 needs to be re-written in simpler terms. Important variables should be discussed and the rests should be presented. Then the authors should do the test and record finding.</p> <p>18. Table 11: Presentation of ARDL Error Correction Estimate Model 1 should be shown in equation. The important parameters should be identified and discusses. The authors should then set-up the test and then present results.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussain, Mohammed E
Department, University & Country	Dillard University, USA