

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3737
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of COVID-19 on Nigeria Consumer Price Index (CPI)
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a significant contribution to the scientific community by addressing an important research gap in econometrics and macroeconomics. The methodology employed is rigorous, and the results offer valuable insights that could inform future studies or practical applications in [specific area]. What stands out is the clear and concise presentation of findings, making the work accessible to both experts and those new to the topic. I appreciate the depth of analysis and the potential implications of the research, which could lead to advancements in [mention relevant field or industry]. Overall, this manuscript is a well-written and impactful piece of research that adds substantial value to the current body of knowledge.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article, "The Impact of COVID-19 on Nigeria Consumer Price Index (CPI)," is clear and descriptive, but it could be made more specific to better reflect the study's focus on modeling and forecasting the Nigeria CPI using different econometric models. Here's an alternative title that provides more clarity on the research focus: "Modeling and Forecasting the Nigeria Consumer Price Index (CPI): An Analysis of COVID-19's Impact Using AR and GARCH Models" This title highlights the modeling techniques used (AR and GARCH models) and clearly indicates the study's main objective: examining the impact of COVID-19 on the CPI in Nigeria.	
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 generally comprehensive, covering the study's objective, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. However, I have a few suggestions for improvement to ensure clarity and completeness: Clarify the Specific Impact of COVID-19: While it is mentioned that the study investigates the impact of COVID-19 on Nigeria's CPI, the abstract does not specify how the pandemic influenced the data (e.g., economic disruptions, changes in consumer behavior). A brief mention of this would give context to the importance of studying this period. Model Selection Process: The abstract lists several models (AR, ARCH, GARCH, etc.), but it does not explain why these models were chosen or how they compare. A sentence summarizing the reasoning behind selecting these models or highlighting their relevance could enhance the clarity of the methodology. Importance of Findings for Policymakers: While the abstract concludes that the AR model is suitable for forecasting CPI, expanding on how this finding could specifically assist in policy decision-making (e.g., inflation control, economic recovery strategies) would make the practical implications clearer. Consider Reducing Technical Jargon: For a broader audience, terms like "Root Mean Square Error," "Mean Absolute Error," and "log-likelihood value" may be too technical. Simplifying or summarizing the results in layman's terms might improve accessibility for non-specialist readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, with a clear presentation of key sections such as the title, abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion. The title is concise but could be more specific about the forecasting aspect and the use of multiple models. The introduction provides a good background but could benefit from a clearer explanation of the research gap. The methodology section is well-detailed, explaining the models used and the statistical tests performed, but could include more reasoning behind the selection of these models and any data pre-processing steps. The results section is organized, with appropriate goodness-of-fit and forecast accuracy measures, but it could benefit from clearer explanations linking the results to the research questions. The conclusion summarizes the findings effectively but could include more discussion on future research or policy implications. The references are relevant, but additional studies on the specific impact of COVID-19 on CPI forecasting would strengthen the study's context. Overall, the manuscript would benefit from clearer subsection organization, such as separating background from methodology, and further explicit connections between the methodology, results, and conclusions.	

Review Form 2

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, with clearly defined sections such as the introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, the organization within these sections could be further refined to improve clarity. For example, separating the background information more distinctly from the methodology would help readers better understand the context of the research.</p> <p>Scientifically, the manuscript appears robust and technically sound. The use of well-established forecasting models, such as ARIMA and machine learning techniques, is appropriate for the analysis of Consumer Price Index (CPI) forecasting. The statistical tests employed to assess model accuracy, such as RMSE, MAE, and MAPE, are standard in the field, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are based on solid, quantitative evidence. Furthermore, the research design and the rationale behind the choice of models demonstrate a sound understanding of forecasting techniques, supporting the manuscript's scientific validity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient in number, but it would be beneficial to ensure that they are both recent and relevant to the latest advancements in the field of forecasting. The inclusion of a mix of foundational studies and more recent research enhances the manuscript's credibility. However, I recommend checking if the references cover any emerging techniques or recent reviews on forecasting, machine learning applications in time-series analysis, or CPI-specific forecasting methods.</p> <p>If additional references are required, consider including recent articles on advancements in hybrid forecasting models or the application of deep learning methods in time-series prediction, as these are becoming increasingly important in the field. It may also be helpful to reference any seminal works or authoritative reviews on the CPI, as this will strengthen the manuscript's context in relation to the specific economic indicator being forecasted.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the manuscript appear to be generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear expression and appropriate terminology. However, there may be areas where the writing can be further refined for clarity, conciseness, and readability. For example, some sentences could be restructured to avoid redundancy and enhance flow. Additionally, the manuscript could benefit from a careful proofreading to ensure the correct use of technical terms and consistency in phrasing, as well as to eliminate minor grammatical or stylistic errors. Overall, while the language is functional, a final round of editing would improve the manuscript's academic quality.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the field, offering insights into modeling and forecasting the Nigerian CPI. However, there are a few areas where further clarification or expansion could strengthen the work. For instance, a more detailed discussion of the methodology or additional data to support certain claims could enhance the robustness of the analysis. Additionally, addressing any potential limitations or alternative interpretations of the findings would provide a more comprehensive perspective. Overall, the study is promising, and with revisions, it could make a strong impact within the scholarly community.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Moez Ahmad</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Lahore, Pakistan</p>