

# Review of: "The Role of Nation and State Institutions in Nigeria's Economy: An Empirical Review"

Afamefuna Eyisi<sup>1</sup>

1 University of Nigeria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the review of the paper titled: The Role of Nation and State Institutions in Nigeria's Economy: An Empirical Review. I have highlighted some comments for the authors to consider, which I believe will strengthen the paper. The comments are as follows:

#### **Abstract**

I think it might be a good idea to strengthen this section in terms of punctuation (also try and leave sentences clear and short). This topic is a common area of research in Nigeria, and I think sampling only 10 papers does not depict a true reflection of knowledge in the topic area. More so, you should conclude your abstract by building more on the findings of your research.

### Introduction

I suggest you review the paper thoroughly as some glaring mistakes cannot be overlooked. For instance, see the first sentence in this section, did you mean researchers? I think there are three authors and not one. Additionally, I think you need to cite some sources between the first and third sentences. Ultimately, watch your citations, they are quite dated. Please see the second paragraph where you talked about your current essay, you went ahead to cite a source from 2020 (Jegede, 2020), which is quite confusing. Within the paragraph, it might be a good idea to cite sources where you defined a state and nation. From the third to the fifth paragraphs, there is no single citation, yet you made strong points that easily could have been drawn from existing knowledge. More importantly, whilst you highlighted the existence of key government institutions and their importance, I reckon you should also touch on the current challenges affecting their responsibilities in line with modern realities in Nigeria.

#### **Theoretical framework**

You started the section once again with the word 'researcher' instead of researchers since there are three authors involved in this research. Please read the first sentence closely, where did 'your' come from?

See 2.2 where you cited (Yahya & Yamin, 2014), it is not the right way to cite a source in that context (you need to remove the bracket and ampersand).

See section 2.3, I think you might want to revisit the list as your source is dated (13 years ago). A good example would



suffice. In 2022, NNPC was changed from a corporation to a liability company. It is now known as NNPC Limited.

Section 2.4 needs a thorough rewrite, especially in the way you started the section.

## Methodology

See the first sentence, you wrote' ...employed in your empirical review...'. I do not understand the 'your' there. What you did in your study is similar to a systematic literature review, so beyond what you have done so far in this section, explain in detail the processes involved in selecting the 10 research articles.

See section 4, the entire paragraph does not make sense; it reads like a comment from a reviewer.

See section 5, I suggest you review it closely to correct some mistakes. You kept using 'researcher', is there only one author? See the fourth paragraph, your citation of 'Olaniyan, O., & Okemakinde, 2019' is wrong.

In section 6, you highlighted the policy implications but left out an important aspect of this research. Throughout the paper, you did not address the numerous challenges Nigeria is currently facing in managing its national and state institutions. Such challenges include corruption at all levels, gross abuse of office, squandering of public funds, poor implementation of the 1999 constitution, bastardization of the judicial system and nepotism in public service. It is highly incongruous to discuss governance in Nigeria without touching on such areas.

Sections 7 and 8 are acceptable but can be sharpened for clarity. The authors did a good job with the reference list. That said, you still need to review the section closely as there are still some inconsistencies. For instance, see Ajadi, T. O. (2010)..., all the first letters of the title of the article should not be in capital letters (same as Adamolekun, L., & Kincaid, J., 1991). More so, the title of the journal and the title of the article are the same (this is wrong).

Overall, in its current form, this paper still leaves much to be desired. Therefore, more work needs to be done before it can attain a publishable status.

Qeios ID: 5773JK · https://doi.org/10.32388/5773JK