

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_124712
Title of the Manuscript:	Corporate Boards and Long-Term Firm Value: Evidence from Nigeria
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 considered important for the scientific community in the sense that it addresses corporate governance effect on firm value. I like the authors choice of independent variables, that is board size, and board independent to proxy corporate Board and the test carried out in determining how each of them impact on firm value.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is ok but it would be better if stated as follows Board characteristics and Firm Value: Evidence from 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 abstract of the study is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structures of the manuscript 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 study did not state the variables (dependent and independent variables) of the study. It did not show research hypotheses as well as research objective (main and specific objectives) to guide the flow of the work Again, data sourced for analysis ought to be presented as appendix in the study. We only saw result of data analysis but did not see the data that was obtained and processed to generate the result shown to us. The above could still be brought into the article to make it more robust both technically and scientifically	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In many occasions, author failed to put relevant punctuation mark (a coma to be more precise) in between words. This is highlighted in the review copy of the manuscript for correction	
Optional/General comments	Subject to implementation of the various concerns raised, the article is satisfactory	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ezeala George
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria