

# Review of: "Impacts of Innovations in Financial Services Delivery on the Macroeconomy in Nigeria"

Mohammad Naim Azimi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Impacts of Innovations in Financial Services Delivery on the Macroeconomy in Nigeria.

## Review report

February 2, 2023

However, the topic of the paper is of interest, but it needs critical revision before publication. I believe that failing to address these comments would lead the paper for rejection.

### Abstract

1. Abstract should be rewritten to motivate readers to go through the study.
2. Here, the authors have claimed some policy implications. What are the specific policy implications? These have to be specifically written at the end of the conclusion section.

### Introduction

1. Novelty of the paper is missing. Authors should clearly write and justify the originality of the study.
2. Contribution of the paper is weak to the body of the knowledge.
3. Figures are not looking so good to fit academic writing. The authors can use proper software to generate these plots rather than simple excel.
4. The organization of the study to ease readers with following the study throughout, is missing. The authors must write a para to show the way the study is organized.

### Literature review

1. Theorization is insignificant. I suggest the authors divide the literature review into different parts, such theoretical framework, recent empirical studies, not just listing the studies.
2. Try to provide a table with summary of the LR relevant to your topic.

### Methods:

1. Equations (5) and (6) are incorrect. The lag operator for the dependent variable in the short-run starts with 0 not 1.
2. Equations (5–10) lacks the trend regressor.

3. Why the authors have used the ARDL model, instead of other time-series models?
4. How any break in data is tackled with the ARDL model used?

## Results

1. The results must start with the estimation and interpretation of the unit root analysis.
2. Tables are quite unprofessionally presented.
3. The authors do not need to report all the output estimation of the software, rather they need to ensure the standard academic writing in articles that is globally accepted.
4. Interpretations are mostly ambiguous. Clear statements should be drawn from the results obtained.
5. Discussion of the findings and comparative analysis with existing studies are weak and somewhere, it is missing.
6. What you have found as new evidence?

## Conclusion

1. It should be totally rewritten. Does not look so professional.
2. Policy implications are missing.
3. Limitation and future research direction are missing.

I suggest the author fully address these comments and send the revised version for the next round of review.