

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 manuscript is unique looking at the contribution from methodological perspective and gender variables used	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is not suitable because the topic does not cover the content as seen. Board Diversity and Stock Returns: Evidence from Listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria	
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.	The source and method of data collection need to be stated clearly	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	This is ok and adequate	
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 research is scientific and robust considering the methodology used. Also the data collected is rich enough and will provide in-depth information. The tool of data analysis is strong as well	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference is recent and relevant. All works used have duly acknowledged.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Good research	

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:	Musa Adeiza Farouk
Department, University & Country	ANAN University Kwall, Nigeria