

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_127132
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Green Finance: How the Banking Sector Can Foster a Low-Carbon Economy</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Paper</b>

#### **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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	Gives an insight on importance of social capital, though why author(s) tried to link with green finance. Justify why the author came up with 'green finance' concept.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Change It! Better go for, 'Role of Social Capital in Building Financial Resilience' <b><i>I see nothing connected with the earlier mentioned title.</i></b>	
<b>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.</b>	Rewrite! Completely mismatched!	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Ok. Discussion needs to be rewrite.	
<b>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.</b>	Calculation seems OK! Write-up language is POOR! Try for better Title for the Paper, though One suggested title is provided.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	Not in APA format.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	POOR!	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Rashesh Vaidya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nepal Open University, Nepal</b>