

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_100322
Title of the Manuscript:	BOARD ATTRIBUTES AND CREDIT RISK EXPOSURE OF LISTED DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN NIGERIA: THE MODERATING EFFECT OF RISK COMMITTEE SIZE
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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. ok 2. yes 3. There was no need to present the research problem, the findings and identify the points for improvement and 4. Ok, just including more citations will better strengthen the article in the textual part</p> <p>5. I suggest you include more citations, I missed the construction of the scientific text 6. Include more quotes</p> <p>I suggest that you include at the end of the introduction the problem to be studied, analyzed. Another need would still be, based on the constructs, to establish a relationship with the research findings, through a bibliographic study carried out.</p> <p>I missed texts and more than one author within each paragraph, this helps to carry out the scientific analysis, validates the foundation, then just compare it with the data and statistical information</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	ok	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonardo Soares Francisco de Almeida
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil