

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126766
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender Diversity and Stock Returns: Evidence from Nigerian Listed Deposit Money Banks
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 author has brought out clearly how gender diversity both at employee, Board and top management and the control variables of the board size, bank age, board independence and foreign directors impact market price per share of listed deposit money banks in Nigeria.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable.	
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.	It brings out the research findings clearly	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are appropriate	
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 author has brought out clearly both descriptive and inferential analysis. Clear discussions on the study findings and conclusions thereof. The listing at of limitations to the study is clearly spelt out.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References applied are recent and adequate.	
Minor REVISION comments	The flow of the language is clear and precise.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Caleb Bw'auma Manyaga
Department, University & Country	Maasai Mara University, Kenya