

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127132
Title of the Manuscript:	Green Finance: How the Banking Sector Can Foster a Low-Carbon Economy
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 significant for the scientific community as it presents groundbreaking research findings that have the potential to advance our understanding in the field. I particularly appreciate the thorough methodology and clear presentation of results in this manuscript, which makes it easy to follow and analyze. Additionally, the implications of the research discussed are thought-provoking and have the potential to influence future studies in the field. Overall, I believe this manuscript provides valuable insights and contributes to the scientific community in a meaningful way.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it effectively represents the content and main focus of the research.	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive in providing a brief overview of the research conducted and the main findings. However, I would suggest adding more specific details about the methodology used and the significance of the results in relation to current knowledge in the field. This would help readers better understand the scope and impact of the research presented in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate as they clearly organize the content and make it easy to follow the flow of the research. The logical progression of the sections helps readers navigate through the information and understand the research findings in a structured manner. Overall, the manuscript is well-organized and effectively presents the research in a coherent way.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to the rigorous methodology employed by the researchers. The use of appropriate research design, data collection methods, and statistical analysis enhances the validity and reliability of the findings presented in the manuscript. Furthermore, the researchers have considered potential confounding variables and limitations in their study, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the research topic and a commitment to producing high-quality research. Overall, the scientific correctness of this manuscript is evident in its adherence to established scientific practices and standards.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes, the references included in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the research and demonstrating a thorough review of the existing literature in the field. However, I would suggest considering adding additional references to more recent studies or alternative perspectives that could further strengthen the discussion and support the findings presented in the manuscript. This would help ensure that the research is current and comprehensive, contributing to the overall credibility of the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and technically precise, adhering to the standards expected in academic publications. The use of terminology and language is appropriate for the target audience of the research community, ensuring effective communication of the research findings and enhancing the overall credibility of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, this manuscript is a valuable contribution to the scientific community, presenting well-structured research with clear methodology and robust findings. The authors have done a commendable job in addressing potential limitations and providing a comprehensive review of the existing literature. The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication, demonstrating a high level of professionalism and clarity in presenting the research. However, the addition of more specific details in the abstract and potential updates to the references could further enhance the overall quality of the manuscript.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayodeji Samuel Omilabu
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria