



**Paper: “Transgenerational Succession’ Effects on Financial Performance of Listed Family Firms in the Arab Countries”**

Corresponding Author: Azzeddine Allioui

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n25p125

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: László BERÉNYI  
University of Miskolc / Hungary

Reviewer 2: David Onguka  
University of Nairobi, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Amir Mohammad Sohrabian  
International Information Technology University (IITU), Kazakhstan

Reviewer 4: Eveligh Cecilia Prado-Carpio  
Technical University of Machala, Ecuador

Published: 30.09.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: László BERÉNYI	Email:
University/Country: University of Miskolc / Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.09.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 15.09.2020
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 48/09/2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The title is a bit long, but it summarizes and describes the content of the paper.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>The abstract is correct, but this paper could have a longer and more detailed abstract due to the increased scientific interest on transgenerational issues.</i>	

<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>There are some questionable grammatical issues, but the text is clear, well-established and readable.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>I found the explanation deep enough.</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The paper follows the requirements of a scientific publication, the structure and wording is acceptable.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Conclusions are in line with the investigations. Maybe, a better emphasis on the statistical results in the discussion and conclusion would be useful.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The paper is based on a wide-range of sources, int-text references are correct.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Transgenerational issues are to welcome. It is popular and essential topic in several societies. This paper is a good contribution to an international understanding of the field. I personally consider it as a ‘soft’ challenge with culture, communication etc., and a regression model may have a possibility of error due to its ‘hard’ approach. Along with this note, I recommend publishing the paper, the results may be of interest. A final grammar check and considering rewriting the abstract are my suggestions.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

-

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name: David Onguka	
University/Country: <b>University of Nairobi</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: 14.9.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>21.09.2020</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>The Effects of Transgenerational Succession on Financial Performance and Growth Opportunities of Listed Family Business in the Arab Countries</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0948/20</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <b>Yes</b>	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Seems to conflict at abstract and objective levels as detailed below</b>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>The findings as per abstract - is on “investment opportunity and growth” while the dependent variables as per heading are “Financial Performance and Growth Opportunities” while the objective is focused on “level and determinant of financials performance” there is need for clarity.</b>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Minor grammatical and spelling errors</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Need to indicate the research design and philosophy adopted</b>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Generally clear with minor errors</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes</b>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

1. The title should clearly reflect the content of the paper - **Transgenerational Succession on Financial Performance** – seems to be the main topic and not growth – the title should be changed to reflect this or “growth” should be factored in the objective and reflected in the methodology and results.
2. Need to indicate the research philosophy and design under guarding the study.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/09/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26/09/2020
Manuscript Title: Transgenerational Succession' Effects on Growth Opportunities and Financial Performance of Listed Family Firms in the Arab Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 48.09.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>(Review References that do not match the text, # 6 , 19, 28 and 42)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**