

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_93203
Title of the Manuscript:	Corporate Mergers, Acquisitions and Value Creation of Firms in Nigeria
Type of the 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.journalajebe.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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract, title and references <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The research subject is relevant, with interesting issues. The aim of the manuscript, what the study found, and how they did it, are quite clear. The title is also informative and relevant. ✓ The references are relevant and recent, but some authors are not correctly referenced. Example (Murgia, 2000) is cited in the manuscript on page 3, but doesn't appear in the references. • Introduction / background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The plan of the article is not announced at the end of the introduction • Literature review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The author addresses only one theory in his manuscript (the theory of efficiency). Many theories have been developed to try to explain the origin (motivations) of mergers and acquisitions or to analyze their consequences. Example: the theory of Efficiency, the theory of Monopoly, the theory of Transfer, the theory of Evaluation, the theory of Empire Building, the theory of Process Theory, the theory of Chaos Theory, etc... ⇒ We suggest to the author to choose and evoke (not all of them) but some of these theories which could serve as a basis for his work. Still in this vein, the author could develop an interesting literature review on some previous empirical work related to his topic. • Methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The process of subject selection is clear and the variables are appropriately defined and measured. So, the study methods are valid and reliable. • Results, Discussion, and Conclusions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The data is presented in an appropriate way. Also, the tables and figures are relevant and clearly presented. Also, the conclusions answer the aims of the study. ⇒ In the conclusions the author should evoke some references or other authors' previous works that support (or are in opposition to) his results. ✓ The limitations of the study are not stated, and avenues for future research are not mentioned. ✓ The results are well presented and interpreted in accordance with the results obtained in various tables. However, the author failed to discuss the factors that are behind such results. By deepening his research on existing theories and previous empirical results, the author could fill these insufficiencies. ⇒ What would be interesting is that the author focuses on the results of the analysis itself, and the relative interpretations and to provide explanations / implications of the results found in relation to the aim of his study. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript shows some spelling and grammar mistakes. Example: "Mergers and Acquisitions <u>play</u> a very important role in corporate finance." instead of "Mergers and Acquisitions <u>plays</u> a very important role in corporate finance."</p> <p>"...it enables firms to achieve various objectives and financial strategies that enhance <u>shareholders' value</u>, ..." instead of "...it enables firms <u>achieve</u> various objectives and financial strategies that <u>enhances</u> <u>shareholders value</u>,...". ⇒ Author may use for example "Grammarly: Free Online Writing Assistant" on https://app.grammarly.com/ or https://www.grammarly.com/grammar-check websites.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript could be accepted and published if the revealed lacks are filled.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Semliko Fulbert Dossou
Department, University & Country	Gazi University, Turkey