



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_31522
Title of the Manuscript:	PREPOTENCY OF NIGERIA SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AMONG PUBLIC COMPANIES
Type of the 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	1. The objective of the study is to determine which of the governance provisions is superior to the other. At the general level, I don't believe that one provision is superior to another. However, an attempt could be made to ascertain which of the provisions has contributed more to a given outcome, which may not necessarily be due to its superiority over the other provisions. I suggest therefore that the research objective be modified to one in which the author seeks to ascertain which of the governance provisions has the biggest impact on the dependent variables. This may affect the direction of the study, but I believe it will add more value to scholarship on this subject. 2. If the above suggestion is accepted, then the author has to go beyond just determining correlation coefficients and run some linear regressions to support his arguments. 3. The Introduction section is too brief and has not given sufficient motivation for embarking on this study. 4. On definition of concepts: (a) The SEC Code of Corporate Governance currently in force in Nigeria was the one introduced in 2011, which replaced the 2003 Code. The author needs to make it clear which of the Codes he has based his study on; (b) Prepotency: what is the authority supporting the definition of this concept? Have there been any previous studies where this concept has been used? (c) Company performance proxies: the explanations here are too brief. There should be more elaboration on what these ratios actually do; a discussion on why these ratios were selected and no other would also enrich the discussion – in other	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	words, what informed the choice (justifications) of these ratios? (d) The definition of public companies is inadequate. Are there other forms of business organizations recognized by law? What distinguishes such other business organizations from public companies? Answers to these questions will enrich this paper and make it more robust. 5. Theoretical Framework: more work is needed here. Academic authorities should be used to back up the definition. Abati (2010) is a journalist, and cannot be a strong authority for an article meant for publication in an academic journal. Additionally, more background materials need to be cited for this theory. What are its origins? What published articles are there on this theory? Are there other theories that could have been used? What are the justifications for the use of this particular theory? 6. Literature Review: this again is too scanty, too brief. What is the current state of research on this subject? Any previous research? What are the results of previous research? 7. Methodology: see my comments in paragraph 2 above. 8. Generally: the paper has not been sufficiently referenced. Sources of ideas that are not original to the author should be duly acknowledged. 9. Conclusion: extensive revision advised.	
Minor REVISION comments	Author should be advised to provide more references to support assertions/postulations that may have been borrowed from other sources.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michael Agamah
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Business and Law, Leeds Beckett University, UK