

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_113300</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>THE MODERATING EFFECT OF BOARD INDEPENDENCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE AND CORPORATE RISK AMONG FIRMS LISTED AT THE NAIROBI SECURITIES EXCHANGE, KENYA</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This paper is interesting and should catch readers' attention.</p> <p>2. The title of this paper is understandable and appropriate.</p> <p>3. Some information provided in the abstract is however unnecessary. For instance, software used needs not to be mentioned. Also. What is causal research design?</p> <p>4. The structure and subsections are appropriate. Nevertheless, because there are many subsections, numbering may help readers to navigate through this paper easier.</p> <p>5. The method used is generally appropriate. However, adding one term into the models at a time may not be completely correct. It is because, if a variable enters the model significantly later on, it means that a prior model without that variable suffers an omitted variable bias.</p> <p>6. The references section look fine.</p> <p>7. Please check Table 1. The maximum value is wrong. Also, this section is way too long because all values from the tables are mentioned again in the text. This is completely unnecessary. Readers would want to know the points/issues from the data rather than repeating information.</p> <p>8. Should the hypothesis be stated in the H1 form?</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. In the abstract, theories mentioned need not to be in capital letters.</p> <p>2. Please check for minor typos and grammatical mistakes.</p> <p>3. A lot of in-text citations are incorrect. Please carefully check and correct.</p> <p>4. Please check the consistency of how capital letters are used in the headings of all sections.</p> <p>5. The terms "least squares" and "random effects" always have "s". Please check and correct.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Siwamong Dheera-Aumpon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kasetsart University, Thailand</b>