

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

Franklin Nakpodia

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper sets out to undertake a literature review of the role of nation and state institutions in the Nigerian economy.

Having read the article, I am recommending a rejection of the paper for the following reasons:

1. The paper only engaged with 10 research articles to generate its findings. The sample size is grossly inadequate, impacting the validity and reliability of the study's outcomes.
2. The literature has not adequately supported the problematisation and business case for the research. In the introduction section of the paper, the authors only engaged with two academic articles. This is unacceptable.
3. In Section 2 (Theoretical Framework), the authors planned to present the theoretical framework underpinning the study. While this section lacks detail, I could not identify any specific theory or theoretical framework in the section. The authors have easily anchored the discussion on state and national institutions on institutional theory.
4. Sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 6 evidence poor academic writing practice.
5. The paper's methodology lacks the expected robustness. How was the data (research articles) collected? What were the stages of the data collection? An in-depth discussion of the use of purposive sampling would have helped. Why collect data from 2023 (no rationale was provided)? It is difficult to understand the rationale for collecting data from 2023, as literature reviews are typically intended to demonstrate how a concept under investigation has progressed in the academic literature over time. What was the data analysis strategy? Did the authors use any software to analyse the data? There are so many methodology questions that this paper failed to address. This raises doubt about the validity and reliability of the research.
6. The authors presented the implications of the study for policy, but did not discuss the implications for the literature and theory.
7. The writing style in the paper could be better. The authors could further limit the use of bullet points. Reading through the paper, some sections read as if the authors were in a hurry to complete and submit the paper.