

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_121012
Title of the Manuscript:	Corporate citizenship and wealth maximisation: a Re-evaluation of Stakeholder Theory Using Evidence from listed industrial goods firms in Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The current paper "Corporate citizenship and wealth maximisation: a Re-evaluation of Stakeholder Theory Using Evidence from listed industrial goods firms in Nigeria" has been developed on most important topic related to the society i.e Corporate Citizenship. The researcher has employed a sound methodological approach. The choice of research design, data collection methods, and statistical techniques is appropriate for the research question. By addressing issues of heteroskedasticity and cross-sectional dependence, the researcher has enhanced the reliability and validity of the findings	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is apt as one can clearly understand what author tried to explore.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	YES, Abstract is comprehensive covering all main points in systematic way within 249 words. As it is satisfactory no changes required.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES, All the sections are well designed and arranged in a systematic manner fulfilling the ideal research design.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The researcher has employed appropriate tools and methods for the study. The use of Panel EGLS to test the hypothesis is particularly commendable as it accounts for both heteroskedasticity and cross-sectional dependence, providing robust estimates.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, 21 References are provided which is a good number for an article like this.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		
	Including additional control variables related to firm characteristics, industry factors, and macroeconomic conditions can improve the model's explanatory power.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sundari Dadhabai
Department, University & Country	Koneru Lakshamaiah Educational Foundation, India