

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_109915
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of the Characteristics of the Board of Directors of Commercial Banks on the Risk-Taking Level
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1). Yes. This manuscript helps to good corporate mechanisms should mitigate excessive banking risk taking and Decision making.</p> <p>2) Title required changes i.e., "Impact of Characteristics of Board of Directors towards risk taking level with special reference to Chinese Commercial Banks"</p> <p>3) Abstract should be summarized.</p> <p>4). Minor changes are necessary.</p> <p>5) Yes</p> <p>6) References are sufficient.</p> <p>1) Abstract: some points are repeated and required connectivity between objectives, analysis, recommendations.</p> <p>2) Introduction: It was nice and clear.</p> <p>3) Methodology:</p> <p>a) Objectives are required for this study. At least objectives are framed in the abstract.</p> <p>b) Research gap not framed in this study, required and look in to it.</p> <p>c) Hypothesis was framed properly</p> <p>4) Results and Discussions: It was great work really.it was excellent.</p> <p>Finally ill appreciate his/her Research work but do some minor changes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Its great and good quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Venu Kesireddy
Department, University & Country	Vaagdevi College of Engineering, India