

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_95824
Title of the Manuscript:	GREEN BANKING PRACTICES OF STATE BANK OF INDIA – SOME INSIGHTS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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>1. The manuscript important for scientific community because this study is able to benefit the community especially in the aspect of green banking products in India.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable. Ok.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is too lengthy and must rewrite according to the formatting. Must include the values of the results for every objective in this study.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript – Not adequate. Must write in sequence which are starting form: Introduction, Objectives, Literature Reviews, Methodology (Data Collection & Analysis Data), Results and Discussion, finally – Conclusion, Limitation, and the Future Study.</p> <p>In section LR - author must discuss in detail about the GAP Analysis? What is the gap between past research and this study? Write it clearly.</p> <p>Also the methodology = Must discuss in detail.</p> <p>5. The manuscript must do the amendments and refer to my comments in the text. The Table must follow the format.</p> <p>6. The references are not adequate, please refer to the 'Guidelines for Author'. Please do the corrections. Only refer to the recent LR (form five years only – from year 2018 until 2022)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language must be proofread from the experts. Please attach the evidence.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, this paper is original with its methods and findings. As I pointed out the MINOR REVISION to be made on this manuscript and believe it will improve the quality of this article. Please do the amendments and refer to my comments in manuscript.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasan Al-Banna Bin Mohamed
Department, University & Country	National Defence University of Malaysia, Malaysia