

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Finance and Management
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEFM_1770
Title of the Manuscript:	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER CHARACTERISTICS AND FIRM VALUE: EVIDENCE FROM CONSTRUCTION AND ALLIED FIRMS LISTED AT THE NAIROBI SECURITIES EXCHANGE, KENYA
Type of the Article	

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The topic is interesting and important. However, this particular manuscript may not be the one that will enlighten business and academic society on the topic. I do not see enough data to proof the significance of this research outcomes.	Okay noted.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Thank you.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	Thank you.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The numeration of the sections makes no sense. If Literature review is 2., why Conceptual Framework is 2.3?	Corrections have been made.
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I am not sure if conclusions can be drawn from investigation of the 4 firms only. Also, assessing CEO's quality from age and nationality perspectives only seems not enough to me. What about industry experience, education, networking, leadership style, etc...	Section headings have been corrected. More references have been added. Research Gaps and Future Directions have been included. Recommendations and Policy Implications have been included.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The paper has lots of grammar mistakes. Professional editing is required. Also, the author has to decide on the format – current way of citing and referencing is a mix of different styles. Author has to decide on one style and to follow.	English editing has been done by experts.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	