

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJEBA_101241  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Financial Ratios and Corporate Governance's Impact on Financial Performance in the Indonesian Stock Market (The Manufacturing Industry's Case) |
| 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.journalajebo.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) |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments<br><br>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)<br><br>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)<br><br>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b><br><br>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b><br><br>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b><br><br>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b><br><br><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> | Yes, it is<br><br>Yes, it is<br><br>Yes, it is<br><br>Yes, they are. Just look that section 4 is called "Results and Discussion" and section 5 is called "Discussion". The author must correct this.<br><br>Yes, I do<br><br>Yes, they are. |   |
| <b>Minor REVISION</b> comments<br><br>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | Yes, it is.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Very good paper with empirical test. <b>Just look that section 4 is called "Results and Discussion" and section 5 is called "Discussion". The author must correct this.</b>   |   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Eliana Mariela Werbin</b>                     |
| Department, University & Country | <b>National University of Cordoba, Argentina</b> |