

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103110
Title of the Manuscript:	CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INFORMATION GOVERNANCE IN THE NIGERIA BANKING SECTOR
Type of the Article	Publication 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><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><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>I agree with the importance of the research topic. However, the author has to write more constructive justification for selecting this topic.</p> <p>The title is attractive but doesn't match with the research question and hypothesis. Nothing there about challenges and recommendations.</p> <p>Recommend to remove the conclusion from the abstract. What is written there can be considered as part of the findings.</p> <p>Many subsections (above 13) in the literature section are of no need as some of them are related to one issue and can be merged. The numbering style is not consistent as the manuscript includes some non-numbered sections while others are numbered.</p> <p><i>The research Question assumes one finding as it states "implementing Information Governance (IG) policies effectively reduce data breaches in the banking industry and ultimately lead to improved profitability"? The last part is not yet confirmed.</i></p> <p>There is no clear description about the number of interviews and how are they used in the analysis. They have been mentioned in the table but the number of interviewees and their use in the data analysis must be clearly written.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to start the first line of the analysis of data by the findings and confirm that the hypothesis is rejected or accepted.</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>The language is simple and clear.</p>	
<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>Ibrahim Elsiddig Ahmed</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ajman University, UAE</b>