

Paper: “Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Lending in Europe: Evaluating the Default Risk of Borrowers in the Context of Gender and Education”

Submitted: 08 February 2023

Accepted: 14 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Corresponding Author: Mauro Aliano

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p60](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n7p60)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gianluca Risaliti
University of Napoli Parthenope, Italy

Reviewer 2: Mondira Dutta
Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I believe the title focuses on the main topics of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I think that the authors have highlighted the above mentioned points

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Considering that I am not a mother-tongue English speaker, I am unable to verify exactly the grammar and syntax. In my opinion, the article is quite readable and understandable in showing the author's thoughts

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I believe that the authors have explained well the methodology to reach their aims. I advise to move the quotes in the paragraph Literature review.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I think that the following sentences must be in the introduction instead of the final part of the paragraph Literature Review

The assessment of default risk in P2P lending platforms has become increasingly prominent due to the unsecured nature of those loans, which makes the ability to predict default risk an essential criterion in identifying credit risk. Based on this, the goal of our article is to evaluate the default risk of borrowers using loan data from Bondora which is a leading P2P lending platform in Europe, established in 2009 and currently based in Estonia, Finland, and Spain. With one million customers, as of May 16, 2022, Bondora has issued P2P loans that total 605.429 million euros.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

I advise to remove the following sentences, because in my opinion they belong to the Literature review

In addition, wives are inclined to be less financially literate than husbands, consistent with a division of labour where husbands manage finances (Hsu, 2016). There are many initiatives to support women's borrowers, especially in poor countries (e.g. Women's Microfinance Initiative – <http://www.wmionline.org/> style="color: rgb(149, 79, 114);">www.wmionline.org

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

In text not in the list of references

Davison (2003)

Pearson and Hotelling

In the list of references not in text

21. Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J., (2009). The Elements of Statistical Learning. Springer Series in Statistics.

37. Siddhartha, M., November 6, 2020, Bondora Peer-to-Peer Lending Data. IEEE Dataport, doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21227/33kz-0s65>.

50. Wardrop, R. and Ziegler, T. (2016). A Case of Regulatory Evolution—A Review of the UK Financial Conduct Authority's Approach to Crowdfunding. CESifo DICE Report, 14(2), 23-32.

53. Yoon, Y., Li, Y., & Feng, Y. (2019). Factors affecting platform default risk in online peer-to-peer (P2P) lending business: an empirical study using Chinese online P2P platform data. Electronic Commerce Research, 19(1), 131-158
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-018-9291-1>

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

in the Introduction I advise that it is better to reduce the citation of the literature and to focus on the main research questions

At the end of the paragraph Literature review . The Authors replied the same sentences that they showed in the introduction

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

I believe the title emphasizes the main points of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I believe the authors have highlighted the aforementioned points.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Since English is not my mother tongue, I am unable to precisely check the grammar and syntax. The paper, in my opinion, is quite clear and understandable in presenting the author's ideas.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

I think the authors did a good job of explaining how they planned to accomplish their goals. I advise against citing too many works from the Principal Components literature because, in my opinion, the approach should be a tool, not the focus of the paper. I believe this is a well-known statistical method.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

I advise the authors to use literary references in the corresponding area. Only if they enhance the literature, in my opinion, could the Conclusion contains a literary quotation.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusions are concise and highlight key points from the paper.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Checking the section carefully, I saw that there are references not contained in the text. I ask the authors to review this section before the publication (e.g. Davison (2003), etc...)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

My comments and suggestions are in the preceding section.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes the title is adequate to the content.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Yes the abstract is clear and provides all the information about the objects, methods and results of the research.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

no

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes the authors explain the methods in the third paragraph, entirely focused on data and methods

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Yes the paper does'nt contain errors.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The discussion and conclusions are accurated and well supported by data and content of the research.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

yes I checked all the references

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer H:
Recommendation: See Comments

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Title may be slightly modified as
"Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Lending in Europe: Evaluating the default risk of borrowers in the Context of Gender and Education"

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The Abstract needs more clarity in terms of the indicators selected for evaluating the default risk borrowers, like Gender and Education.
It should focus on the main goal of the study that is to evaluate the default risk of borrowers using loan data from a European P2P lending platform via a leading P2P lending platform in Europe and currently based in Estonia, Finland, and Spain. Some limitations and challenges of the study may also be highlighted.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Grammar is more or less fine

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methodology seems clear except the fact that too many tables have been displayed. The text needs to focus only on the findings and not the procedure obtained step by step. These tables (4,5,6,7,8) are all important but these may be added as annexures at the end . The text may only quote the values obtained and used for analysing the data. Eigen values and eigen vectors may all be added at the end as annexures. Every table must be preceded with a Table No and a Table name. The source of the data may be added in italics at the bottom of the table on the left hand side in smaller font. Table No 2 may delete Slovakia as its value is insignificant.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The discussion part or the main body of the paper may be discussed under three sub heads

Role of Gender in Default Risk of Borrowers

Role of Education in Default Risk of Borrowers

Role of Health care in Default Risk of Borrowers

Some more graphs and figures could be depicted for the tables constructed

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Conclusion may be elaborated more on the basis of the sub heads of the body

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References such as. <http://www.wmionline.org/>" style="color: rgb(149, 79, 114);">www.wmionline.org) need to be at the end in references. It needs to be in APA style. This is not comprehensible and cannot come under Conclusion. All the references need to be quoted as intext in APA style. They are not referenced in the text at all.

This needs to be redone.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper needs to revisit the references and represent them in a standard format. Some of the tables may be removed from the text. Certain sub heads are essential for the paper to gain visibility
