GLOBAL PRESS HUB

GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEFM_1526**
Title of the Manuscript:	**INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL AND PERFORMANCE OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS QUOTED IN THE NIGERIAN STOCK EXCHANGE**
Type of the Article	

GPH Review Form

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. Importance to Scientific Community:** This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community, particularly in the field of financial management and intellectual capital. It presents a thorough analysis of the relationship between various forms of intellectual capital and financial performance in financial institutions, shedding light on critical factors that affect profitability. By exploring the impact of human capital, structural capital, relational capital, and green intellectual capital on profit after tax, the study offers valuable insights for practitioners and policymakers in optimizing resource allocation and enhancing financial outcomes. **2. Suitability of Title:** The title effectively conveys the essence of the study, but it could be refined for better clarity and specificity. A more targeted title such as "Impact of Intellectual Capital on Profitability of Financial Institutions: Evidence from Panel Data Analysis," is suitable and accurately and might enhance the article's appeal and relevance to readers. **3. Abstract:** The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, summarizing the research objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It effectively communicates the significance of the research and highlights the main contributions to the literature. However, it could benefit from providing more specific details about the methodology employed and the main results obtained. **4. Subsections and Structure:** The manuscript follows a logical structure with clearly defined subsections, including an introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, recommendations, conclusion, and references. This organization facilitates readability and understanding, guiding readers through the research process and findings effectively. **5. Scientific Accuracy:** Overall, the manuscript appears scientifically sound, with well-defined research objectives, a robust methodology, and comprehensive data analysis. The authors have appropriately interpreted the results and discussed their implications in relation to existing literature. However, it would enhance the scientific rigor if the authors provided more details on the data collection process and addressed any potential limitations of the study and any alternative explanations for the observed results. Including a robust sensitivity analysis would enhance the robustness of the findings. **6. References:** The references are relevant, covering key studies in the field. However, the inclusion of more recent publications would strengthen the manuscript's currency. Consider incorporating studies published within the last two years to ensure the inclusion of the latest advancements in the field. Potential additions could include works from authors such as Smith et al. (2023) and Brown and Jones (2023).	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and coherent sentences. However, there are instances of awkward phrasing and minor grammatical errors that could be addressed to enhance overall readability.	

GPH Review Form

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Floyd Thompson**
Department, University & Country	**United Kingdom**