

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_101119
Title of the Manuscript:	FINFLUENCE OF COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF INDIGENOUS BANKS IN NAIROBI, KENYA
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.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>Yes, the manuscript generally is good because it followed the acceptable format for presenting a scientific research paper.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract was well stated.</p> <p>Both the subsections and structure are appropriate in line with a good article.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the above, in order to enrich the manuscript. The keywords and JEL classification codes should follow an alphabetical order. • The background of the study is adequate but the statement of the problem of the author is not clear. It is not enough to base a problem statement on issues of controversy by scholar. • There is need to properly link the theories up with the research problem and state the theory that the work was anchored on. • The empirical review should be arranged in the order of year or name. • In methodology, in the second line the researcher should complete the sentence that's "on the performance" of indigenous Banks in Nairobi Kenya, for more clarification. • The data analysis was well stated and interpreted. • In the discussion of findings, it was logically done but NOT empirically aligned. Results were not properly interpreted. Both significant and insignificant were not articulated of what may be the likely consequences. • Conclusion and Recommendations were too generic. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chinelo Jenevive Obiekwe
Department, University & Country	Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria