

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_102433</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>STOCK VALUATION AND BUSINESS PERFORMANCE OF PROPERTY INDUSTRY POST COVID-19 ERA: CASE STUDY PT B</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 '**lac k of N o velt y**', 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 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is clearly important and contributes greatly to the study of Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Social Support as Predictors of Entrepreneurial Intentions among Women in South East, Nigeria.</p> <p>2. My opinion in terms of the title of the article is that it is appropriate and publishable from my point of view.</p> <p>3. As far as I am concerned, the abstract of the article is very well written, and I think it is well worth reading.</p> <p>4. In terms of the structure and subsections of this particular investigation, they are appropriate and suitable.</p> <p>5. In my opinion, the manuscript is scientifically obvious and correct.</p> <p>6. References are not sufficient and few references are required to check because they are not in accordance with the manuscript such as</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Dobbs, M. E. (2014). Guidelines for Applying Porter's Five Forces Framework: A Set of Industry Analysis Templates. 32-45.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, the article's language/English quality is suitable for scholarly publication.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zafrul Allam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Bahrain, Bahrain</b>