

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_122238
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF ASSET GROWTH AND SYSTEMATIC RISK ON COMPANY VALUE WITH PROFITABILITY AS AN INTERVENING VARIABLE
Type of the Article	Quantitative research analysis to assess impact of selected variables on the value of the firm

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 The researcher has applied a tested model and the results conferred the phenomenon of the previous results in the context of selected companies under consideration	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 research is all about studying on a phenomenon either to disclosing a new dimensions of application or confirming or non-confirming the disclosed phenomenon in a different or distinct context. This is one of the research results conferred the discovered phenomenon.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	fair	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	optimal	
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 context and the model applied are compatible and well tested. The scope and objectives are well connected within the model for the analysis. The methodology of multiple linear regressions is the most used technique in measuring the impact of the variables in the assessment of the phenomenon.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	fair	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	good	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Sreedhara Ramesh Chandra
Department, University & Country	Atria Institute of Technology, Visvesvaraya Technological University, India