

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_94947</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CAPITALIZATION AND EFFICIENCY OF CEMAC BANKS : AN INTERMEDIATION APPROACH</b>
Type of the 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The study has potential, but for this, it is necessary to make adjustment for strengthening and possible publication.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Here are some suggestions for two sections below. <b>3. Methodological approach</b> I noticed that this section is incomplete, since there is further study of only the specific procedures. I suggest to present more specifically what you are studying (study area or research subject), the intellectual strategy or the study method (Study delineation), and inform how more clearly the data were analyzed (data analysis). The inclusion of these points and their details help the reader to accurately understand the study. <b>4. Results and Discussion</b> This section needs to be improved because there is data analysis, but there is no validation or confirmation of the results (only 3 citations in this section). In the section analysis and discussion it is indispensable to answer the following questions : what is happening ? And why is this happening? After the results it is necessary to validate with the state of the art or literatures that confirm the conclusion. That's the logic. I suggest rearranging.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)  The manuscript is suitable for publication because of ensuring the ethical issues of a scientific study.	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Josimar da Silva Freitas</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Center of the State of Pará, Brazil</b>