

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Current Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOCS_1784
Title of the Manuscript:	Energy Access and Poverty in Nigeria: An Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Investigation
Type of the Article	Manuscript

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it addresses the critical intersection of energy access and poverty, a topic central to achieving sustainable development goals in Nigeria and beyond. By employing the ARDL approach and analyzing long-term and short-term dynamics, the study provides robust empirical evidence linking energy availability to poverty alleviation. It fills a notable gap in the literature by considering specific indicators like electricity generation, consumption, and access alongside carbon emissions, offering nuanced insights. The findings contribute to the broader discourse on sustainable energy policy, providing actionable recommendations that can inform policymakers and researchers working on poverty reduction and energy infrastructure development.	Noted and revised
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Energy Access and Poverty in Nigeria: An Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Investigation," is suitable as it clearly conveys the main themes of the study. It highlights the focus on energy access and poverty in Nigeria, which is central to the manuscript, and specifies the methodological approach (ARDL) used in the investigation. This provides potential readers with an accurate understanding of the content and scope of the research. However, the title could be slightly refined for enhanced clarity and appeal by emphasizing the significance of the findings, such as: "Investigating the Impact of Energy Access on Poverty in Nigeria Using ARDL Analysis."	Noted and revised
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive in terms of presenting the key elements of the study, including the research problem, objectives, methodology, major findings, and policy recommendations.	Noted and revised
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the following observations: Robust Methodology, Comprehensive Analysis, Logical Interpretation of Results and Well-Supported Conclusions but attention is needed on Justification of Variables	Noted and revised
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a broad range of references, covering both theoretical and empirical studies, which provide a strong foundation for the research. Key works cited, such as studies on energy transition theory and empirical analyses from Nigeria and other regions, demonstrate the breadth of research reviewed.	Noted and revised
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication.	Noted and revised
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	