

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_114917</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Examining the Influence of Risk Management Committee Dynamics on Financial Performance: A Case Study of Listed Insurance Companies in Nigeria</b>
Type of the Article	

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in the literature by investigating the relationship between risk management committee dynamics and financial performance in the Nigerian insurance industry. Its findings provide valuable insights and practical recommendations for enhancing risk management practices in listed insurance companies, contributing to academic understanding and industry resilience.</li> <li>2. The Title could be more concise. For instance, consider "Risk Management Committee Dynamics and Financial Performance: Nigerian Insurance Companies Study." - 8</li> <li>3. The abstract could offer more detail on the specific methodologies used for data analysis (descriptive and inferential statistics) and the implications of the findings. This would give readers a clearer understanding. - 7</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure appear appropriate for a journal article</li> <li>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, the study's main argument is the importance of committee size without exploring potential challenges or differing perspectives. The scientific rigour of the manuscript would be enhanced if the author presented the literature review more critically by presenting conflicting viewpoints from existing literature regarding the optimal committee size. The author should highlight the lack of consensus in the literature and suggest that further research is needed to explore the nuanced effects of committee size on risk management outcomes. Further, there is room for improvement in areas such as discussing non-significant results in more depth, further interpreting the findings, addressing potential confounding variables, discussing practical implications, and acknowledging study limitations. - 7</li> <li>6. The references are not so recent. It would be beneficial to include more recent references to ensure the relevance of the literature review.</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Additional comments</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Elaborate on the study limitations and potential biases to enhance transparency and credibility.</li> <li>8. Strengthen the connection between the study findings and existing literature on risk management and corporate governance.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language and English quality of the article seem to be generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are a few areas for improvement regarding conciseness and clarity in some sentences to enhance readability and comprehension for a scholarly audience. Using a word editor like Grammarly could be useful</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>N/A</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>Colin Agabalinda</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The ICT University, Uganda</b>