

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_100996</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Board Diversity and Dividend Policy of Listed Health Care Companies in Nigeria: The Moderating Effect of Financial Performance</b>
Type of the Article	<b>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 (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. 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>Given the limited sample size of 10 companies and the use of a correlational model, the manuscript may provide preliminary insights but should be interpreted cautiously, limiting its overall importance for the scientific community.</p> <p>The title appears to be suitable as it clearly conveys the main focus of the study</p> <p>Yes, it is. But there is no key word after the abstract in this article!!!</p> <p>Overall, the sub-sections and structure of the text organize the information logically and present a complete analysis of the subject.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct.</p> <p>it appears that the manuscript includes a diverse range of sources related to the subject. Some of the references are recent and relevant, however, it is important to note that most of the references are old. Given the subject matter here are some additional references: - Agyei-Mensah, B. K., Kyei, C. and Boamah, N. A. (2021). Board Gender Diversity, Dividend Policy, and Firm Performance: Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. Journal of Business Research, 132, 13-24. - Imran, R., Wu, Q., Shah, S. Z. A., &amp; Ahmed, S. (2021). Board Gender Diversity and Dividend Policy: The Role of Firm Characteristics and Corporate Governance Mechanisms. International Review of Economics &amp; Finance, 71, 554-570.</p> <p>the problem in this article is divided into two points 1 the problem of originality: the idea is no longer innovative, but perhaps in the Nigerian context it is original. 2 most importantly, the use of ten listed companies during the study period can be considered a relatively small sample for inferential statistics, especially if the census approach is adopted. A larger sample might offer better representativeness of the population and enable more robust generalizations.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall, the language in the provided text is quite good. The sentences are well-structured, and there is a clear flow of ideas. However, I noticed a few areas where improvements could be made to enhance clarity and coherence</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>the methodology section needs to be revised as it no longer details the method adopted to process the secondary data used. the sample size needs to be extended</p> <p>the methodology needs to be more detailed</p>	

### 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:	Mohammed Alami Chentoufi
Department, University & Country	Morocco