SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
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	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

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)
-There is need to recast the Abstract, particularly the methodology part, for example "the top performing five banks" Tenses used in reporting actions taken needs not be present tense.	
- Citations needs to be put right, for example, [1] Chakrabarthi R (2001), Narayana Rao K.V.S.S. & Bhole L.M (1990). Proper referencing should be followed.	
- 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.	
- Some results (Table 2.1- Table 2.4) were found under Methodology section which ought not to be so.	
- Variables in the regression models need to be explained	
-The author(s) should read the manuscript properly so as to correct typographical and grammatical errors.	
- The authors need to discuss result better, and re-organise the paper accordingly	
	-There is need to recast the Abstract, particularly the methodology part, for example "the top performing five banks" Tenses used in reporting actions taken needs not be present tense. - Citations needs to be put right, for example, [1] Chakrabarthi R (2001), Narayana Rao K.V.S.S. & Bhole L.M (1990). Proper referencing should be followed. - 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. - Some results (Table 2.1- Table 2.4) were found under Methodology section which ought not to be so. - Variables in the regression models need to be explained -The author(s) should read the manuscript properly so as to correct typographical and grammatical errors.

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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? (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olumide Adesina
Department, University & Country	Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)