



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJEMT_17072
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Gender Diversity on the Performance of Non-Financial Listed Firms in Ghana
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	RESULTS The authors should provide some statistics regarding the model ('seudo' R-Squared, Wald tests, etc.), in addition to the coefficients linked to the variables. CONCLUSIONS I do not see a clear cause-effect relationship between findings and conclusions. According to the results, from an economic perspective, performance is not affected. Having a more balanced board does not lead to better performance figures. Therefore, the findings do not allow to support statements such as 'To benefit from the increasing important assets that women bring to companies...' According to the results obtained, gender diversity may be proposed on the basis of social and moral reasons. In this regard, the conclusions contain social recommendations which are not directly derived from the results.	The other statistics do not really explain the relationship between the variables. Even though they were done, the results were send to the appendix section. CONCLUSIONS It is well noted and corrected.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	LEVERAGE: In the text, the authors specify 'the ratio of total assets to total debt' as their measure of leverage. However, in the table, another definition is included (debt to equity). In fact, 'debt to equity' is a direct measure of leverage; however, 'assets to debt' is a measure of solvency, which is obviously related to leverage, but it is not directly	LEVERAGE: It has been noted and corrected .



SDI Review Form 1.6

	leverage. TABLE 1: The figure 64.17 is misleading. It seems that there exists a 64.17 percentage of women. TABLE 2: ROA. If the maximum is 0.30, mean (13.85) is confusing. Please check if 0.30 as the maximum figure is correct.	TABLE 1 The figure has been checked and corrected. TABLE 2 The figure has been checked and corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript deals with an interesting topic, which faces controversial perspectives and requires further study to reach to clear conclusions. The contribution of the authors is useful. It links with previous empirical evidence from an international sphere, and provides a valuable insight about the situation in a developing country, in a male-dominated society. Their results, therefore, may be especially interesting.	