



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_49766
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Non-Financial Determinants on Indian Banking Stocks – An Empirical Analysis
Type of the Article	Original research papers

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>-There is need to recast the Abstract, particularly the methodology part, for example “<b>the top performing five banks....</b>” Tenses used in reporting actions taken needs not be present tense.</p> <p>- Citations needs to be put right, for example, [1] Chakrabarthi R (2001), Narayana Rao K.V.S.S. &amp; Bhole L.M (1990). Proper referencing should be followed.</p> <p>- Author(s) should give more details in the methodology section; the author kind of mix-up primary data with secondary by mentioning multistage research design in the Abstract whereas the data used appear to be secondary. This needs to be clarified.</p> <p>- Some results (Table 2.1- Table 2.4) were found under Methodology section which ought not to be so.</p> <p>- Variables in the regression models need to be explained</p> <p>-The author(s) should read the manuscript properly so as to correct typographical and grammatical errors.</p> <p>- The authors need to discuss result better, and re-organise the paper accordingly</p>	<p>-Sentence restructured keeping in view the comment of the reviewer.</p> <p><b>-The citations are corrected as given in the example</b></p> <p>-The data collected is from secondary sources only i.e. annual reports of banks, reports of Central Statistics Office and financial journals. The same is now mentioned in the Methodology section</p> <p>-The necessary modifications are made as per the comment.</p> <p>-All the variables in the regression model are explained clearly</p> <p>-All the typographical and grammatical errors are cleared after thorough scrutiny</p> <p>-The necessary modifications are made after thorough examination of the paper</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>	