



**Paper: “The Impact of Institutional Investors’ Holdings on Performance Sensitivity to Management Compensation in China”**

Corresponding Author: Cheng Min

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n19p238

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Akinola Akinwumi Olusegun  
Achievers University, Owo, Nigeria

Reviewer 3: Robert McGee  
Fayetteville State University, USA

Published: 31.07.2020

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 8 May 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 31 May 2020
Manuscript Title: The impact of institutional investors' holdings on performance sensitivity of executive compensation in China	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 70.05.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

<b>I made some notations on the manuscript.</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<i>I am not familiar with the literature on this topic, so I do not know if important literature is missing.</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):** The quality of the English is very good. One recommendation I have would be to break up the text into shorter paragraphs. On some pages, there is just one paragraph, which makes the page less visually pleasing and more difficult to read. I have made a few editorial comments on the manuscript. Take a look at them and make the necessary changes.

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020***

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.  
***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

Date Manuscript Received: 8 <sup>th</sup> May, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 <sup>th</sup> May, 2020
Manuscript Title: The impact of institutional investors' holding on performance sensitivity of executive in China	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:    No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:    Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:    Yes	

## **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Well-structured topic)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(A brief recommendation should be included in the abstract)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Author should proof-read for grammatical and punctuation errors)</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Adequate explanation of research methods and definition of variables)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Authors should proof-read for grammatical and punctuation errors)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Adequate Summary, conclusion and recommendation were given)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(References do not conform with APA format)</i>	

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

The article adequately contributes to knowledge with appropriate methods used and accurate conclusions.