



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hussin Jose Hejase
Department, University & Country	Al Maaref University, Lebanon