

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128274
Title of the Manuscript:	Nexus Between Corporate Governance and Financial Performance: An Empirical Study on the Fourth Generation Private Banks of Bangladesh
Type of the Article	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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study contributes to the theory building on corporate governance and informs the practitioners on need for compliance to the existing corporate governance guidelines for improved business performance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Appropriate	
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.	Well presented.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically correct, though suggested corrections are necessary.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient, though consider avoiding more than 5 years empirical studies, further include references on corporate governance codes, guidelines (OECD, Cadbury report etc). Or national guidelines as they inform the practice.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author needs to proofread the article to address major typos, grammatical errors, punctuation errors, spacing of paragraphs etc 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please reorganise the study by moving the Literature review section to come after the Objectives of the study, so that Data and Methodology section can come before Findings and analysis section. In the introduction, highlight the corporate governance guidelines that the Bangladesh banks are supposed to comply with. In introduction, expound on the study problem, by providing additional statistics to show existing governance problems with the commercial banks. Proper spacing of the paragraphs is recommended. Need for consistent in citation, there is a mix up of different citation styles. Under, Presentation of the models to be estimated, you seem to suggest three measures of bank performance as ROA, ROE and NPL, but only ROA and ROE are discussed and analysed. On Development of Hypotheses, adopt the null hypothesis, don't mix them. Advisable to present individual attribute of corporate governance in their own paragraph under literature review for flow of ideas. Other it seems rather mixed up. You have 7 attributes of corporate governance, but Research model 1 & 2, only shows 6 attributes. Risk Management Committee (RMC) seem to be omitted. What is the explanation? It is a good practice to cite the founders of the theories. Variance inflation factor should be undertaken before the regression analysis. If you were to detect multicollinearity after the conducting regression analysis, how will you proceed? Highlight a section on limitations in this study after the conclusion and recommendations 	

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:	Dennis Mucee Ncurai
Department, University & Country	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya