



Manuscript: “Does Cultural Diversity of Board of Directors Affect Corporate Environmental Performance? Evidence From the Energy Sector”

Submitted: 16 October 2020

Accepted: 27 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Eugenio D'Angelo

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p287](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n28p287)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Jacques Hendieh
Arab Open University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Remy Nyukorong
Stichting Kongregatie FIC, Maastricht, The Netherlands

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: Remy Nyukorong	
University/Country: Stichting Kongregatie FIC, Maastricht, The Netherlands.	
Date Manuscript Received: 20-10-2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 26-10-2020
Manuscript Title: Does Cultural Diversity on Board of Directors Affect Corporate Environmental Performance? Evidence from The Energy Sector.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1107/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: YES	
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]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
First, I confirm that the title of the paper is clear, and it is adequate to the content of the article. The title is also informative and interesting.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract is presented in a structured format with clear objects, methods, and results. However, I suggest that instead of "empirical analysis..." (line 6), authors	

could say, “panel data methodology was use as the analysis tool...”	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
I approve that the manuscript reveals few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
I agree that the research methods are explained clearly. Methodologically, a multiple regression analysis with panel data is used. The authors have comprehensively described the sampling procedure, explained the dependent, independent and control variables, and presented the analysis technique in detail. Under the empirical framework section, it would have been appropriate for the authors to briefly explain what they mean by “ <i>a pooled ordinary least squares regression</i> ” particularly in relation to Fixed Effects (FE) model and Random Effects (RE) model. In other words, why panel data is being used in this study?	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
I agree that the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. For instance, in the introduction, the aim of the study and outcome measures are clearly defined with appropriate reference to the literature. Also, the results section analyzed the main findings of the study on the headings: descriptive statistics, multivariant analysis etc. However, I did not see an explicit discussion of the results in relation to previous studies. To be precise, mention how your results compare to (reference given to author) another study which was published very recently.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
I support the fact that the concluding remarks are accurate and supported by the content. The conclusions are based on the findings/results of the data analyzed. The study aims have been answered. Furthermore, the limitations of the study are clearly presented, and future research areas suggested.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I approve that the references are comprehensive and appropriate. Some of the fundamental/recent papers in the field are cited, among these are Calton and Payne (2003); Ferreira (2010); Frijns et al. (2016); Gallego-Alvarez et al. (2015); Jensen and Meckling (1976); La Porta et al. (2008); Liang and Renneboog (2017) and Ortas et al., (2019). 	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

Overview

The paper is original. It explores the relationship between cultural diversity of board and corporate environmental performance within the energy sector. A regression analysis of the effect of cultural diversity on the board was performed to see the impact on the corporate performance. Moreover, it is an interesting study and the authors have collected a unique dataset using cutting edge methodology. The paper is generally scholarly-written and structured. The main contribution of the paper is its demonstration that the board's cultural diversity supports the achievement of better corporate environment performance is particularly stronger among energy firms from civil countries than energy firms from common law countries.

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

- On pages 10 and 11, authors used “we” (the first-person pronoun) five times under the sub-section, data collection and sampling procedure. Authors shall not use the first-person in the text (Refer to Author Guidelines, ESJ).
- On page 9, line 17, it is stated: For example, Liang and Renneboog (2017) analyzing a sample of 23,000 companies from 114 countries find that companies from *civil law countries* have higher corporate social responsibility ratings than companies from *civil law countries*. Please, can you check the comparison and correct it?

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

- References: Authors should ensure that all required elements are present in the reference list entries – completeness and correctness following the APA referencing style.
- The manuscript needs to be edited for grammar and syntax. The authors may consult the ESJ proofreading/editing services department or the following website: <https://mariekekrijnen.com/services-and-rates/> for the appropriate assistance.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The methodology is robust, the statistical analyses are suitable; and in terms of evidence-based research, this manuscript is conventional and the subject significantly original to merit publication following revision.

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: Jacques Hendieh	
University/Country: Arab Open University / Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: DOES CULTURAL DIVERSITY ON BOARD OF DIRECTORS AFFECT CORPORATE ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE? EVIDENCE FROM THE ENERGY SECTOR	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1107/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
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]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>Of board of directors (instead ON)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Good abstract, no changes needed</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>Yes, a proof reading is required</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The authors clearly explained the methods used.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>Minor grammatical errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is accurate; it clearly states the finding.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>Up-to date relevant references were used. The in-text references should be standardized the authors should use only form. Few errors in the list of references.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	x
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

- (1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

A proof reading is a must, there is some grammatical errors. In addition, the authors should improve the in-text citations and the list of references; both should be standardized.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: