

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_101442
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF GREEN BANKING PRACTICE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN NIGERIA: AN ELECTRONIC BANKING SYSTEM APPROACH
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:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/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>The manuscript is well-organized and in an acceptable form. But, need to improve some points.</p> <p>The manuscript can be considered for publication if the author(s) revise the paper more precisely and improve the manuscript accordingly.</p> <p>This paper is important for scientific community, but authors should disclose the information elaborately and more scientifically.</p> <p>Presentation: good.</p> <p>Abstract: okay. Sentence structure is good. Better to use few statistical values (e.g. p-value, some values regarding the key findings).</p> <p>Introduction: need improvement. Use references (where truly necessary). Describe the rationale of the study. Author(s) should mention the key objectives of the review with justification.</p> <p>Methodology: quite okay. Better to elaborate some points.</p> <p>Data analysis: Okay, but check the analysis again.</p> <p>Results: Some changes required. Presentation of key findings using some graphs and figures is appreciated. Structure of this part is not appropriate. Better to use more figures.</p> <p>Discussion: Need improvement. (Check the review)</p> <p>Conclusion: Recheck this part precisely. Use more text to explain the key findings precisely and recommend some effective suggestions.</p> <p>References: All the references must be arranged consecutively/serially in the text for better understanding and recheck according to the journal's guidelines. Some references do not cited properly. Author(s) have to check the reference section again. Highly instructed to use more and recent reference.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check grammatical mistakes precisely. • Few sentence structures are not well-written. Author(s) should check the English language, typographical, grammatical errors etc. very carefully • Do not repeat same idea, aspect, sentence, and word in different paragraphs. Better to represent differently. <p>In some cases, need justification.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise and improve the manuscript following the reviewer's comments before final submission • Revisions required • Need clarification in several points. <p>Reviewer encourages the author(s) to check each and every reference precisely, and arrange it perfectly according to the Journal's format for better representation.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shourav Dutta
Department, University & Country	Rangamati Science and Technology University, Bangladesh