

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	Original Research 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 <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 article is well-written and comprehensive. The article's topic has been expertly chosen and presented in detail.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Adequate and offering a comprehensive understanding of the research article's theme	
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.	Adequate and offering a comprehensive understanding of the research article's findings	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Matching with the journal prescribed format.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the hypothesises have been described properly. 2. Methodology section is complete and depicting all the analytical tools used in result and discussion section. 3. The result section is self-explanatory and does not need any correction. 4. Abbreviations used in the research article should be mentioned in a separate section. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Absolutely fine, author has mentioned recent and adequate number of references in the research article.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No correction required.	
Optional/General comments	No comments.	

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:	Subhadip Pal
Department, University & Country	The Neotia University, India