



Paper: “The Female Dimension of the Board of Directors and its Impact on Firm Value: A Narrative Review”

Submitted: 13 August 2025

Accepted: 14 October 2025

Published: 31 October 2025

Corresponding Author: Sara Gigli

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n28p48

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Robert Szucs
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 2: Angelica Selene Sterling Zozoaga
Universidad del Caribe, Mexico

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title directly reflects the article's scope (female presence on boards, firm value, narrative review). It is concise, informative, and aligned with the main theme of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract identifies the object of study (female dimension of boards and firm value), describes the method (narrative review using Scopus), and hints at results (importance of women's role in value creation). However, it remains somewhat descriptive and less explicit about concrete findings.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The English is generally correct and readable. Minor issues are present (occasional awkward phrasing, repetition, or inconsistent tenses), but there are no serious errors that hinder understanding.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology is presented (non-exhaustive narrative review, keywords, Scopus database, 43 documents reviewed). This is clear and replicable to some extent. Still, the explanation is relatively brief, and limitations (e.g., only Scopus, only two keywords) are acknowledged but not deeply justified.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The results (distribution of studies by year, country, and subject; citation counts; identified trends) are clearly presented with tables. They are descriptive rather than analytical, which fits a narrative review, but the interpretation could be deeper.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions reflect the findings (increasing importance of gender diversity, identification of cultural and relational drivers, need for further empirical research). They are consistent with the review but could have been more concise and better structured to highlight specific contributions.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The reference list is extensive, up-to-date (with works up to 2024), and relevant to the topic. It covers seminal works and recent studies in corporate governance, gender diversity, and firm value.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

*Please rate the **METHODS** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]
5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is solid, well-structured, and relevant. Some areas (abstract clarity, depth of results, style polishing) could be improved and more detailed.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, it describes the article content in a general way

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It is essential to articulate the research's purpose more clearly; some of the ideas presented in the summary may detract from its focus. In accordance with the title, the summary should primarily focus on the women's participation on the board of directors, followed by the methodology used and the results obtained. Therefore, it is suggested that the summary be restructured to express this more clearly and concretely.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Some of the paragraphs need revision in order to present the ideas in a more straightforward and more specific way

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the methods are explained thoroughly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

There is some information that corresponds to a different section, they are marked on the document

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Although conclusions are interesting, some of the information should be in other sections, for example, the first paragraph is part of the introduction or results section.

The conclusions must be directly related to the research purpose and the methodology employed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

There are some citations in the reference list that are not found in the document; they are marked in yellow.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The methodology mentions that 43 documents were reviewed; however, the results only partially reflect the findings. The complete information should be included, possibly in a table.