

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103349
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Accounting Practices and Business Health of Listed Oil and Gas Firms in Nigeria (2012-2021)
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.journalajebea.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>(1) The importance of the article for scientific community is not in doubt.</p> <p>(2) The title is suitable</p> <p>(3) The abstract contains a lot of irrelevant materials which makes it to be unnecessarily lengthy. Findings in the abstracts should be summarized and pointed rather than discussing them. Words in the abstract should be reduced to 250 or as specified by the journal as against the 452.</p> <p>(4) First, the sub-section like "Theoretical Review" should be read "Review of the Theory" or "Theoretical Framework." Secondly, Discussion of Findings should come before Implication of the Findings or be merged together since it is when findings are discussed that implications are drawn from the findings discussed; Finally, the section that read "Contribution to the studies" is more suitable for "Significance of the Study" which I don't think is necessary here.</p> <p>(5) The manuscript is scientifically correct if comments noted in the copy are addressed.</p> <p>(6) References are sufficient.</p> <p>(7) The manuscript contains a lot of typographical and grammatical errors as marked in the copy.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Comments should be addressed to make it more publishable.	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kusugh Ternenge
Department, University & Country	Veritas University, Nigeria