

Review of: "Why Corruption in Nigeria? Experts' Accounts on the Occurrences and Persistence"

Mansur Muhammad¹

¹ Usmanu Danfodiyo University Sokoto

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract: the author didn't explicitly state the findings of the research. It is appreciable the background information about corruption in the country, but author should reduce the paragraphs to accommodate discussions on method, findings and way forward/recommendations. The keywords should not be more than five words and keywords should reflect the key issues discussed in the abstract. For example there is no mention of the qualitative research in the main body but appears in the keywords, secondly, occurrence, persistence are general words that should not appear in the keywords.

Introduction: the paper is well introduce, however, the key contribution(s) of the study should be clearly spelt, secondly, the scheme of chapters should be in a separate paragraph.

Literature review: the literature consulted are well analysed, although it will be of a great benefit to the readers if the author could update the literature up to 2023. There are works relating corruption to economic growth, inflation, welfare and many more. Author may find these literature unrelated to the objective of the study, but they bring out the beauty of the work if synchronise and synthesised with the practice and empiric. Similarly, author should find a theoretical framework for this study - social contract theory and lot more could be linked to corrupt practice in Nigeria.

Methodology: both qualitative and quantitative approach could be employed in this research. It is understandable the author went for qualitative, however, the discussion of the method is far from rigour. I expect explanation as why qualitative research, what did previous authors say about using qualitative, what is the framework and conceptualisation. It is understandable that the author use interview, but issue of saturation is very important, in a country with over 200 million individuals, 24 interviewee from 2 offices may not yield saturation. If the author believe the number is consider optimal, then state the previous work who did similar research with that number. It is understandable that the author use thematic analysis, but it was not clearly stated in the methodology section.

Analysis: well, this section is well writing and the findings are discussed in more detail.

Conclusion: more needed to be done in this section. author need to bring out the beauty of the work by providing excellent conclusions, especially rigorous discussions on the findings, policy implications and recommendations of the research. In this kind of study, one paragraph conclusion is unacceptable.

Reference: the author should try to use modern referencing software e.g mendeley, endnotes, zotero etc

Technical note: corruption is multidimensional, only one aspect is discussed in this paper (which is financial/monetary

corruption in public sectors) the author should re-frame the title to suit the discussions in the paper. By narrowing the study down to a niche more interesting findings could emerge