Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_48600**
Title of the Manuscript:	**BOARD INDEPENDENCE AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN NIGERIA AND CANADA**
Type of the Article	*__Original Research Article__*

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	There is need for the **topic or title** to be **adjusted**, so that, it will **accommodate** the **constructs** (**variables**) adopted for the study and align with the analysis performed in the study. **Note:** change '**board independence**' to '**board characteristics or features**' **Line 42 and 43** contradict the period in which your data covered, that is, you are talking about 10years (i.e. 2008-2017) panel data methodology. There should be consistency with the period under review or study. The study was able to demonstrate comparative analysis of Canada and Nigeria corporate governance theoretically; this has not been reflected in the analysis. Since **regression methodology** was adopted to check for **prediction**, the study should also have used **Chow-test** to check for difference in prediction between Nigeria and Canadian deposit money banks. This would have established the practical, theoretical, methodological significance and contribution to knowledge in terms of comparative study. (see line 206-207) Line 68-97; the literature focused more on board independence while the analysis performed considered other board characteristics. Note that your analysis and model specification must be in line with your research topic, objective, question and hypothesis (see line 156-163). Your model contained firms' characteristics which deviate from your topic and objective, there is need for the topic and to be aligned with the model (see line 157-159). **Line 183-185:** (Table1) Why **Ghana** in the study? **Line 194-205:** Diagnostic test should be sent to appendix should not be part of the main analysis you can just refer to it when writing your report.	1. The study examines board independence which was captured by **BIND= Proportion of Independent Non-Executive Directors on Board** and **ACI= Audit Committee Independence** The other variables are control variables and this was clearly explained in the methodology. So, I strongly stick to the topic to remain as "board independence". board characteristics covers a wide range of board features such as board gender, foreign executives on board, etc. 2. Line 42 and 43 speaks about a consistent positive financial performance from banks in Canada. However, it does not limit the scope of the study. It only highlights a streak of positive performance by banks in Canada as opposed to banks in Nigeria. 3. The study was able to demonstrate comparative analysis of Canada and Nigeria corporate governance theoretically; this has not been reflected in the analysis. **Comment:** it has been adjusted in the results interpretation. 4. Since regression methodology was adopted to check for prediction, the study should also have used Chow-test to check for difference in prediction between Nigeria and Canadian deposit money banks. This would have established the practical, theoretical, methodological significance and contribution to knowledge in terms of comparative study. (see line 206-207) **Comment**: the methodology of the study only compared the regression analysis to see the effect of board independence on financial performance of banks in Nigeria and Canada. Chow test does not fall under the scope of the study 5. Line 68-97; the literature focused more on board independence while the analysis performed considered other board characteristics **Comment:** every other board characteristic variables were control variables. the focus of this study is on board independence. 6. Note that your analysis and model specification must be in line with your research topic, objective, question and hypothesis (see line 156-163). Your model contained firms' characteristics which deviate from your topic and objective, there is need for the topic and to be aligned with the model (see line 157-159). **Comment:** they are in line with stated objective 7. Line 183-185: (Table1) Why Ghana in the study? Comment: done. 8. Line 194-205: Diagnostic test should be sent to appendix should not be part of the main analysis you can just refer to it when writing your report. Comment: the diagnostic tests have interpretation so I think it is necessary to put it in the analysis as well as discussion of results.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

	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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	