

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_83819
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of ESG Performance on the Change of Z-score Before and After the COVID-19 - Taking Chinese A-share Manufacturing Industry as A Sample
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:

(<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>Abstarct : The abstract focuses more on the research findings. This article presented the research findings, but it was not accompanied by a brief explanation of the significance of these findings or the reasons that support these findings. As an example, the better the ESG performance, the more unfavorable the company's overall financial situation. This statement was not accompanied by a brief explanation.</p> <p>Intoduction : The introduction describes why this research is needed, and how previous studies' findings indicate that more research on ESG performance is needed. It also discusses the research objectives related to the variables used, the relationship between variables, and the methods used. This article only discusses aspects of ESG performance in the introduction but does not mention the variables used, the reasons for using these variables, or the methods used.</p> <p>Methodology : There is no justification for using the z score to evaluate a company's financial performance.</p> <p>Result : In addition to reading the results of data processing, a discussion of research findings in relation to theory, previous research, and research data that support the discussion should be carried out. This article's discussion of the results is simply reading statistical results without any discussion that is supported by supporting theories and previous research. The discussion should be interesting because the characteristics of companies in each country differ sufficiently for readers to understand the characteristics of Chinese companies. Unfortunately, the discussion is not available in this article.</p> <p>Conclusion : The conclusion includes the research question's answer as well as a brief discussion of the research findings and their managerial implications for investors and the government. It also reveals the research's shortcomings. In this article, the discussion of research problems has not been accompanied by reasons to support the research findings, and they have not used these findings to provide advice to companies, further research, the government, and investors.</p>	Thank you for the valuable comments, I have revised them according to the comments, and highlighted them in yellow.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	There are <u>NOT</u> ethical issues in this manuscript	