

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_93068
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmental Disclosure Practices and Sustainable Performance of Quoted Manufacturing Companies in Nigeria
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:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

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	<p>Author(s) are advised to cross check the findings on Environmental disclosures and the conclusion drawn thereafter. In the abstract, the Authors found EDD to have insignificant effect on Performance, but concluded that EDD in general significantly impacted on performance. This is contradictory.</p> <p>The study found that while environmental disclosures (EDD) exhibited a negative but insignificant effect on Returns on Assets (ROA), Debt to Assets Ratio (DTA) and Market Price per Share (MPS) of the sampled firms, Social Disclosures (SDD), firm size and firm age exerted significant positive influence. The study therefore concluded that environmental disclosure practices in general significantly impacted sustainable performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria.</p> <p>The conclusion is too general. Authors should specifically draw conclusion and recommendation from the keys findings.</p> <p>The literature review is quite good.</p> <p>On Methodology, I am afraid that in all the models, the Adjusted R² is always very low, suggestive of the very low coefficients of determination. Example;</p> <p>The Adjusted R² stood at 0.111. This implies that the within the context of the model used, the independent variables alongside their respective surrogates are accounting for 11.1% variations in debt to assets ratios while the balance 88.9% is clarified by factors currently outside the model. This means that independent variables do no explain the model used. This is worrying.</p> <p>Sentences like, In addition, the F-statistics of 22.22 with an associated p-value of 0.0000 implies that the entire model is statistically significant at 5%, thus we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which affirms that environmental disclosure practices has a significant effect on market price per share of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria</p> <p>In Statistic, we either reject the Null or I fail to reject the null. We cannot we accept the alternative hypothesis. This is very wrong. Such comments should be corrected during revision.</p> <p>Generally, The author is advised to correct the interpretation of all the models.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Generally, The manuscript need proofreading to correct for grammatical errors while aim to improve the overall readability and quality of the manuscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The general presentation is quite good but the analysis and methodological section need serious revision to account for the factors influencing the sustainable performance of the Manufacturing companies in Nigeria.</p> <p>The conclusion and recommendation section are quite general. Thus authors are advised to be specific on the key regressors for conclusion and recommendation.</p> <p>The manuscript need major revision on the statistical section of the manuscript before publication.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	William Angko
Department, University & Country	Simon Diedong Dombo University of Business and Integrated Development Studies, Ghana