

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPAS_126940
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency Analysis of Public and Private Sector Banks in India using Slack-Based Measure of Efficiency
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the efficiency of public and private banks in India, a topic with significant implications for financial stability and economic development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It could be improved. Add a sentence at the beginning explaining the motivation or gap that this study addresses.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, there are.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The use of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) with the Slack-Based Measure (SBM) model and comparison between public and private banks contributes to a detailed analysis of efficiency.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It could be improved.	
Minor REVISION comments	It could be improved.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The article deals with a relevant topic. However, some corrections are needed before it can be published. Spelling needs to be corrected. In the introduction, it is necessary to point out the contribution of the article. The use of methodology should be better justified in the context of the research. The literature review could be extended with similar studies for other countries and could also highlight gaps in the current literature that this study aims to fill. The results should be compared with those of other studies. The limitations of the study need to be stated, such as the sensitivity of the results due to the presence of outliers.	

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:	Wellington Ribeiro Justo
Department, University & Country	Regional University of Cariri - URCA and Federal University of Pernambuco – UFPE, Brazil