

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_124104
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Organizational Culture on Risk Management Practices and Outcome In Banking Sector 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it explores the understudied relationship between organizational culture and risk management in the Nigerian banking sector. By examining leadership, accountability, effective challenge, and compensation, it provides practical insights into how these cultural factors influence risk management outcomes. However, there is a need to rewrite the introduction.</p> <p>I appreciate the manuscript's relevance and good methodology, particularly its use of quantitative data. However, it could improve by employing more diverse sampling methods for broader generalizability. Overall, the study offers important contributions to understanding risk management in high-risk industries.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is generally comprehensive but could be refined for clarity and conciseness. Here are a few suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Simplify sentence structure: Some sentences are lengthy and can be split for better readability. Clarify the methodology: It's important to briefly mention why convenient sampling was chosen beyond "availability and accessibility." Highlight significance: It would be useful to emphasize the significance of the findings and how they contribute to existing literature or practice. Remove unnecessary details: Some detailed points, like the specific software version used (SPSS version 22.0), may not be essential for the abstract. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>In as much as the intent of the research is good but structural deficiency exist in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Research model/framework Practical contributions Theoretical contributions Conclusion Limitations Future research 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-defined research objectives and methodical approach. The use of a descriptive cross-sectional research design and a structured questionnaire ensures systematic data collection. However, Using Smart PLS (Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling) instead of SPSS could offer several advantages for this study, especially given the nature of the research.</p> <p>The manuscript does not explicitly discuss limitations, which is a crucial aspect of scientific research. Addressing limitations would enhance transparency and allow for a better understanding of the study's scope. Some potential limitations that could be discussed include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling method: The use of convenient sampling may introduce bias, as the sample is limited to personnel at commercial banks in the University of Lagos, which may not represent the entire Nigerian banking sector. Sample size: While 131 respondents provide a decent dataset, a larger and more diverse sample might yield more generalizable results. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>3. Self-reported data: The reliance on self-reported questionnaires could lead to response bias, as participants might overestimate or underestimate their perceptions of organizational culture and risk management practices.</p> <p>Including these or other limitations would provide a more balanced view of the study's findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>Here, to start with, there is a clear need of a new literature review. Majority of the citations were not recent. Unless if it is necessary current research gap should be found in literature not more than 5years. I do not need to mention some. There are lot of literature on Risk management and organisational culture. Please refer to a good data base.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Requires proofreading by language expert.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed Abubakar
Department, University & Country	Sohar University, Oman