

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

Compulsory 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>Review Report for Ms_AJEFM_1770</p> <p>Dear Authors,</p> <p>I have some suggestions that may help improve your manuscript:</p> <p>1. I would recommend revising your abstract to follow this structure: Context (10%), Objective (10%), Methods (20%), Results (30%), Conclusion (20%), and Significance/Implication (10%).</p> <p>2. Your manuscript does not adhere to the IMRaD article protocol: Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion. I would suggest the following changes:</p> <p>a. Change 1.1. Introduction and Background to be 1. Introduction</p> <p>b. Merge 1.2 Statement of Problem into 1. Introduction</p> <p>c. Change 2.1, and 2.2 to be part of sub-section of Introduction. It means the numbering should be 1.1 and 1.2 accordingly.</p> <p>d. Move 2.3 Conceptual Framework to be a sub-section under Methodology, it means 3.1 Conceptual Framework</p> <p>e. Change 4.1 Data Analysis and Discussion to be Results. All existing sub-sections remain as are.</p> <p>f. I do not find solid discussion section on your paper. Please create a new section of 3. Discussion. In your new discussion section, you must present your academic position on your research results and compare them with previous research on a similar topic. You must also provide more concrete implications for academics, practitioners, and the government (if any).</p> <p>g. Your conclusion section is short. Please include other sub-subsections on limitations and future research avenues in the conclusion section</p> <p>3. Other minor suggestion: Your English is good, but I find some grammatically errors, if you can have the revised draft proofed read by a native or professional, it will further enhance the readability.</p>	

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:	Haryanto Haryanto
Department, University & Country	Padjadjaran University, Indonesia