

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_95533</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECT OF FINANCIAL LEVERAGE ON MARKET VALUE OF LISTED DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN NIGERIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>I appreciate the writers responding to my first criticisms. Some of my further remarks in light of the article's adjustment are related to some of the changes made, so the authors might want to talk to the editor about these specific recommendations. The only remaining criticisms I have are limited to the results' interpretation and the accuracy of the data supplied.</p> <p>Please provide a structured abstract that includes important summary data.</p> <p>The research question and your justifications for asking it at this time should be the main topics of no more than three paragraphs in this.</p> <p>The variables in the imputation model included both those that predicted non-response and/or were linked with outcomes. Can this be described? It is not apparent to me how it was determined which variables predict non-response or what correlations were employed. The entire section on the various imputation models used for various variables appears to be rather difficult and not well detailed. It's challenging to think that the analysis could possibly be repeated exactly as reported. Is it possible to provide this information about imputation as an appendix? – The ordinary reader may not be interested in the technical information. In response to the criticisms, the authors have sufficiently revised their article. It was enjoyable to read.</p> <p>In order for reviewers and readers to completely grasp what happened in the trial, the manuscript for an intervention study has to provide sufficient details regarding the intervention(s) and comparator(s) (even if this was standard care). Please also offer (uploaded as one or more auxiliary files, including video and audio files where applicable) any relevant extensive descriptions and resources so that readers may duplicate your study or adopt the treatments in their own practises. As an alternative, kindly provide in the text any URLs to freely available websites where you may get these items.</p> <p>Please follow the Statistical Analyses and Methods in the Published Literature when reporting statistical components of the study (SAMPL). Please include in your structured abstract's results section (as well as, of course, in the article's results section).</p> <p>This carries over into how the results are presented and requires that the imputation analysis be provided as a sensitivity study to the full case analysis. The inferences and interpretations of the data are severely limited, however, because two of the developed measures' validity and reliability investigations were insufficient, and one of the constructed measures had a poor reliability score.</p> <p>The writers have addressed my main issues in a beautifully written and comprehensive response to the remarks from the prior review. In conclusion, despite the fact that I have a tonne of questions, I think the authors will be able to adequately respond to them by making changes to the text, at which time I will be pleased to suggest the paper for publishing in Nature Communications.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Muneeb Ahmad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>JiangXi University of Finance and Economics, China</b>