

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_97562
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Check-and-Balance on the Relationship between Financing Constraints and Investment Efficiency - A Case Study of the Software and IT Service Industry of Chinese Listed Companies
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 1.7

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, it is. 2. Yes, it is. 3. It can be improved. 4. Yes, it is. 5. It can be improved. 6. It can be improved.</p> <p>First of all I would like to thank you for this opportunity to review this interesting and current manuscript.</p> <p>Although the manuscript can be improved in the following aspects: In the abstract, perhaps the research gap covered should be justified, since it is not clear to the reader, and the methodology used could be mentioned more clearly, since it is not clearly specified. In the introduction section, the research gap covered should be justified in greater detail in the same way that this same proposal is made for the abstract, and more emphasis could be placed on the objective of the research, since it is difficult to understand what the authors' objective is, and it is also recommended to add a small paragraph describing the parts of the research that will be analyzed. Congratulations because the authors make a brief review of the literature. However, it is too short and with references that are not very updated and current, since much more has been written on the subject in the current years and most of the citations that appear in this section date from 2012 or even 2000. I advise that it has been updated with more current citations included in the same way in the journal in which it is intended to be published. All this will lead to describe a research gap that is covered by the manuscript which is also not described in this literature review section. Especially in section two one and two two it would be necessary to apply this recommendation. Double congratulations to the author is because within this section the research hypotheses that are intended to be covered from the literature review performed have been described. Within the methodology section I advise that Figure 1 be clearly specified because it is not understandable to the reader. In addition, it would be necessary to mention not only the title but also the source from which the figure was obtained. The results section begins with a descriptive table that makes the reader get lost, as the section begins with a paragraph describing what is going to be done in this section, and the source of the commentary that can be applied to all the tables in the manuscript does not appear in this table. I recommend that this aspect be reviewed in all the tables and figures of the manuscript. Similarly, the description of tables two and three, for example, is not clearly specified since it is only briefly mentioned in a small paragraph. I suggest that the content be explained more clearly in the same way as it is done in tables 4 and 5. Regarding the conclusion and recommendations section, the objective of the manuscript is clearly identified; however, I would advise including a small paragraph describing the research gap covered by the manuscript. I congratulate the authors because the results and the main recommendations derived from the manuscript are clearly specified; however, a small allusion to the limitations of the future line of research derived from this investigation is missing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is.</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:	Madel Consuelo Ruiz Rodríguez
Department, University & Country	University of Jaén, Spain