Review of: "Exchange Rate Pass-Through and Inflation on Unemployment in Nigeria"

Hubert Gabrisch[1]

1 Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies

I think that the author should change his/her manuscript in four respects:

- Firstly, the introduction lacks an overview of what the reader can expect in the course of answering the research question (section one, section two etc.).

- Secondly, the literature review lacks a critical discussion. As it is written now, it seems aimless. In my opinion, the purpose of a literature review is to identify the lacking answers in the research to the specific question in this article, and thus also to emphasise the added value of one's own efforts. This is what I miss in the text, and the author should complete it.

- Thirdly, the author should explain why he/she uses methods other than those previously published on the subject and, above all, why this variety of methods is used. The text threatens to be engulfed by an econometric maelstrom. What is wrong with the model in equation (1)? If it has no meaning, it is redundant. Why ARDL, NARDL, SVAR? Surely, it is quite common to check the main method used with robustness checks. However, one method is usually sufficient.

- The author should consider whether the empirical tests (e.g. unit root tests) should not come before the choice of econometric model. Whether series are I(0) or I(1) determines whether I can use an ARDL model.

In addition, I have a number of ambiguities in the text.

- Under Table 1 I find the incorrect statement that "The ARDL can be used whether the variables are a mixture of I(1) and 1(0) or the same level as long as none of them is I(2)." If *all* variables are I(1), a simple OLS regression with first differences should be estimated. If *all* variables are I(0), an error-correction model without complicated bounds tests with the levels can be used. An ARDL model is appropriate in the case of a mixture of both.

- In addition, the results of Table 1 are not clear. For level and first difference of the inflation rate, the p-values are 1.00000. Either the inflation rate is I(2) and an ARDL model does not give meaningful results, or it is a misspecification if I(2) is not present either. This should be checked.

- On one page under Table 3, pension funds appear as another determinant of unemployment. I do not understand why and what role it plays for the further considerations.

- Under Table 4, in which, as in all tables, unemployment is the dependent variable, I find the following sentence: *The coefficient of RER is 0.002736, which implies that an appreciation of RER by 1% will lead to a 0.27% increase in labour force participation.*" This statement is difficult to understand. Firstly, LFP has so far not been a variable, but unemployment. Secondly, an increase in unemployment, as in this case as a result of a real appreciation, suggests an

increase in unemployment, but not necessarily an increase in LFP, ceteris paribus. This is because the LF also includes the unemployed. A decline in the number of employed and a simultaneous increase in the number of unemployed should not change the size of the labour force. I recommend not using LFP when interpreting the estimation results, but sticking to the term Unemployment. This also applies to all following estimates. Thirdly, the author should briefly define whether a real devaluation is included in the estimate with a positive or negative sign.

- An autoregressive model is dynamically stable ('stationary') when the inverse roots of the AR process are positioned strictly within the unit circle. This test refers to the long-term part of the EC estimates. I wonder why this was not checked in the stability tests. The bounds test is not sufficient.
- What is equation (3.9)?

Finally, I prefer manuscripts, even in gdf-form, with page numbers!