



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_31537
Title of the Manuscript:	NIGERIA 2011 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND PERFORMANCE OF DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS
Type of Article:	Original Research Paper

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. Compared with the original paper, the author totally changes the objective of the revised manuscript. Therefore, it's better to resubmit the revised manuscript as a new paper. 2. The new manuscript just find that "there was significant difference in the performance indices of banks in Nigeria as compared to their performance prior to the implementation of the 2011 SEC code of corporate governance", and didn't provide any policy implication. In my opinion, the economic contribution of the new manuscript is insignificance.	1. Author disagrees. The main research objective, in lines 116 – 117, page 4 of the manuscript of the original paper is "to evaluate the effect of 2011 SEC CCG on the performance of DMBs in Nigeria" is one and the same thing with the main research objective in lines 6 – 7, page 4 of the revised manuscript which is also "to evaluate the effect of the 2011 SEC CCG on the performance of DMBs in Nigeria". Furthermore, Directors Remuneration (DRM) and Board Committee (BCOMT) in the original paper together with Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), Liquidity (Casht), Capital Adequacy (eqtta) and Tangibility (Fasta) are all one and the same as they are all performance indices for evaluating public corporations whose shares are listed in the Nigerian Stock Exchange. But based on the evaluation of the manuscript of the original paper by four (4) other reviewers and their expert suggestions towards improving the quality of the research, DRM and BCOMPT were substituted in the five specific objectives with roa, roe, casht, eqtta and fasta in the revised manuscript because they are specifically more appropriate, relevant and current performance proxies to DMBs and other financial institutions in Nigeria. DRM and BCOMT, as performance proxies apply generally to all public companies in Nigeria. Therefore, it is not necessary to resubmit a revised manuscript which was based on other reviewers' expert advice/recommendation, as a new paper. The substitution of the general performance indices (i.e. DRM and BCOMT) in the original paper with more appropriate and relevant performance indices (i.e. retoa, retoe, casht, eqtta



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

	and fasta) in evaluating the performance of the same DMBs in Nigeria in the revised manuscript has not transformed it into a new paper but only improved the original paper significantly. 2. Author disagrees. The research findings that revealed “a significant difference exists in the performance of DMBs before and after the implementation of the 2011 SEC CCG in Nigeria” is a major contribution to knowledge in Management. There is the presence of sufficient evidence of this in the academic rigours of this research undertaking with disclosures of this in the revised manuscript stating the period of the research between 2006 – 2015, the research problem and the objectives that evaluated the effect of the 2011 SEC CCG on DMBs performance in Nigeria, derivation of performance proxies from DMBs financial statements comprising retoa, retoo, casht, eqtta and fasta, the review of relevant literature, the principal-agency theory framework of this investigation together with the methods of estimation including descriptive statistics, analysis of correlation matrix, the Wilcoxon Sign-Test, findings and recommendations with radical fundamental implications towards improving the existing provisions of the 2011 SEC CCG in Nigeria are of great significance in contribution to knowledge in Management but without prejudice to expert opinion of this reviewer.
--	--