

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_100996
Title of the Manuscript:	Board Diversity and Dividend Policy of Listed Health Care Companies in Nigeria: The Moderating Effect of Financial Performance
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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract it is well written, and we can understand the question addressed in a broad context, the purpose of the study, the main method and the main findings and contributions. However, I suggest that the authors should rewrite it more concisely, about 150-200 words. The literature review focuses the relevant topics for the study. However, Literature review should include more recent sources (2020-2023) and be enriched with relevant references The authors must add the keywords with keywords more specific to the article In my opinion, a section of conclusions that includes theoretical and managerial implications, research limitations, and future research directions would be helpful 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The article is interesting and the researched problem has scientific potential. The title is concise, specific, and relevant. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate The reading of the text is clear (textual coherence and cohesion). The authors should briefly present the steps of the research (possibly in a figure). <p>The article has scientific value and can be published after carefully reviewing the reported issues.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manh Hung Le
Department, University & Country	Trade Union University, Vietnam