

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	

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.	The manuscript provides a comprehensive analysis of the impact of energy access on poverty in Nigeria using the ARDL approach. The findings are significant and contribute to the existing literature on the subject. The methodology is well-explained, and the results are clearly presented.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Energy Access and Poverty in Nigeria: An Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) Investigation" is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the study on the relationship between energy access and poverty in Nigeria using the ARDL approach.	Noted
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 provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including the research purpose, methodology, key findings, and recommendations. It effectively summarizes the key aspects of the research. No additional points need to be added or deleted from the abstract.	Noted
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, and the methodology used is appropriate for the research question. The analysis and interpretation of the data are sound, and the results are supported by the findings presented.	Noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided in the manuscript are relevant and recent, covering a wide range of studies related to energy access and poverty. No additional references are needed at this time.	Noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written and effectively communicates the research findings and recommendations.	Noted
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the relationship between energy access and poverty in Nigeria. The findings are significant and contribute to the existing literature on the subject. The recommendations provided are practical and relevant for policymakers and stakeholders in the energy sector.	Noted

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	