Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJOM_53808**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Forecasting of the Nigeria Stock Returns Volatility Using GARCH Models with Structural Breaks**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	In general, a very good and attractive subject. Actually a well developed paper with minor corrections. The author was very clear in his research plan. The abstract is clear and provides clear introduction to the parts of the paper The introduction is appropriate and uses the adequate references to definitions and main arguments needed for the paper. The literature review is good and streamlined. The literature is satisfactory to tie the title, the abstract and the literature itself to the methodology and later on to the discussions. The methodology is appropriate The results are clear, well presented appropriate to support the discussion about the objectives of the paper. The discussion is very good and appropriate because it does support the objectives declared through the paper Conclusion and recommendations are adequate Minor Proofreading is needed **Referencing needs careful review of write up consistency**	Reference corrected
Optional/General comments	**Copy of corrected paper is attached**	All observations made were treated .

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	