



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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	<p>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.</p> <p>Note: change 'board independence' to 'board characteristics or features'</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The study was able to demonstrate comparative analysis of Canada and Nigeria corporate governance theoretically; this has not been reflected in the analysis.</p> <p>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)</p> <p>Line 68-97; the literature focused more on board independence while the analysis performed considered other board characteristics.</p> <p>Note that your analysis and model specification must be in line with your research topic, objective, question and hypothesis (see line 156-163).</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Adeaga Caleb Jesuwunmi
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria