

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	

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.	This manuscript addresses a significant research gap by exploring the impact of corporate governance on the financial performance of fourth-generation private banks in Bangladesh. This focus on a specific generation of banks is novel and timely, as it provides new perspectives on governance mechanisms in a competitive banking landscape. The study's emphasis on board size, independence, and gender diversity provides valuable insights for bank regulators, policymakers, and practitioners. Moreover, the use of panel regression with data from 2014 to 2023 adds to the robustness of the findings, offering evidence-based guidance for the development of corporate governance frameworks in emerging economies .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but it could be more precise. Consider changing it to: "Exploring the Impact of Corporate Governance on Financial Performance: Evidence from Fourth-Generation Private Banks of Bangladesh." This slight rephrasing emphasizes the originality and evidence-based approach of the paper.	
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 provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. However, some improvements can be made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include numerical results (like coefficient values or significance) to give readers a quick glimpse of the main findings. • Remove redundancy (e.g., "results find" can be rephrased to "The results reveal..."). • Avoid subjective language like "practical implications" and instead state these explicitly (e.g., "The results highlight that board independence increases ROA by X%, implying that banks should..."). 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study is scientifically sound , but some areas need clarification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify the use of a random effects model instead of a fixed-effects model, even after the Hausman test is discussed. • Explain why some factors (like Board Gender Diversity) are found to be insignificant. Could this result be due to the specific context of Bangladeshi banks, or is it in line with findings from other regions? • Elaborate on the multicollinearity analysis and its effect on the study's findings. The VIF test is mentioned, but further clarification on how multicollinearity was addressed is needed. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The paper includes a substantial number of references, including several recent studies from 2022 and 2023 . This demonstrates that the authors have engaged with current research. To further strengthen the relevance of the literature review, consider integrating 1-2 additional recent studies (if available) on corporate governance in South Asian or emerging economies to provide greater regional context."	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper's language is understandable, but numerous grammatical errors reduce readability. Key issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typos: "corpate" → "corporate," "influnce" → "influence," "Baesd" → "Based" • Sentence structure: Some sentences are too long and need to be split for clarity. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redundancy: The introduction discusses the importance of corporate governance multiple times. Focus on key points, avoid repetition, and aim for brevity. • Variable Definitions: Ensure consistency in the names of independent and dependent variables (e.g., "SIZE" is sometimes written as "Bank Size"). • Hypotheses: Formalize the presentation of hypotheses with a list or bullet points for clarity. • Statistical Reporting: Clearly present key regression results. Rather than simply stating "BSIZE has a positive impact," provide the coefficient and significance level (e.g., BSIZE = 0.00378, p < 0.05). 	

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:	Poojan Parikh
Department, University & Country	H L College of Commerce, Gujarat University, India