



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_35994
Title of the Manuscript:	Firm Risk, Performance and Executive Compensation: An investigation on China Listed Firms
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The objective of the paper is fine, however, I have the following comments for author(s). 1. Some of the statements in the manuscript were expressed as "active voice". For example, in line 163, author(s) wrote "... I apply three stage least square (3SLS) method...". I feel it would be more appropriate to write ...three stage least square (3SLS) method was applied... Author(s) is/are advised to revise tenses in the manuscript accordingly. 2. The references used in the manuscript are rather old. The most recent (Fahlenbrach and Stylz, 2012) is over 5 years old. Going by citation analytics, none of the references cited will be useful for computation of even 5 year impact factor. It is hoped that more recent references can be more useful. 3. The following references: Core and Guay (2002); Rogers (2002); Coles et al., (2006); Guay (1999); Rajgopal and Shevlin (2002); Yang (2010); Servaes (1994); Bhagat and Ilch (1995); Opler et al., (1999); Bizjak et al., (1993); Guay (2002); Chen et al., (1998); Yang (2011a,b,c) were not reviewed but cited in very pertinent sections of the manuscript. Why? If they are pertinent, why were they not reviewed? Reviewing should involve pertinent background.	Response to comment 1: an additional paragraph explaining the 3SLS along with a reference paper was added on page 4-5 in the revision. Response to comment 2: References were updated to include the most recent studies including papers in past three years in the session of Background and Literature. See page 3. Response to comment 3: These references were provided for interesting readers for comparison of empirical results between this paper and other papers. In the revision, some of these references were removed.
Minor REVISION comments	As above	
Optional/General comments	As above	