

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	

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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is relevant for the specialized scientific literature due to the fact that this concept of green banking is approached at the level of financial institutions globally, and the solutions proposed by experts in the field can create a multiplier effect at the level of the financial industry.</p> <p>The title of the paper corresponds to the topic analyzed by the authors of the paper.</p> <p>The abstract of the paper is adequately designed by the authors of the paper, clearly highlighting the proposed purpose, the methodological tools (a structured questionnaire among 400 customers in Hyderabad and analyzed with the help of appropriate statistical tools) and finally the aspects related to the results obtained.</p> <p>The structure of the paper is logical, but we suggest the authors of the paper, after the "literature review" chapter, to mention the "Research methodology" chapter, as well as the presentation of the research results as a distinct heading, so that the authors respect the academic rigors regarding the way of structuring and presenting the research results. Therefore, we suggest the authors of the paper to revise the structuring of the paper.</p> <p>The concepts, citations and bibliographic sources are presented by the authors of the work, but we suggest completing the bibliographic sources with relevant works in accordance with the researched topic, from the main academic platforms that offer open sources.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The way of writing the work and the quality in English of the article is appropriate for academic communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work is relevant from the point of view of the theme, as well as the results achieved by the authors of the work, but from the point of view of academic ethics it must be revised accordingly, being aspects more of the form (structure of the work) than of the scientific background of research issues by the authors of the paper.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manta Otilia
Department, University & Country	Romanian Academy, Romania