



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJ SSE_47685
Title of the Manuscript:	CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT DIMENSIONS AND NIGERIAN BANKS' PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM ZENITH BANK PLC
Type of the Article	

**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>)

**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	More information on questionnaire results as well as better description of questions included in the survey is missing – as it is missing an evaluation of the results cannot be made. Conclusion and recommendation I consider as weak part of the study – conclusions should be more clear, recommendation (or rather implications) should more reflects results of the study	Please, kindly suggest what to do again to make the paper robust.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	More characteristics on the bank could be beneficial (especially its position towards competitors, current situation of Nigerian banking sector, how it differ from other countries in the region, how it differ from developed countries.  I did not see questionnaire nor majority of results – therefore I can have doubts about the fact whether the research was done. Normally, the questionnaire and its results can be provided in appendix (or just provided for the review process and not published).	The scope of this study is limited to CRM strategies and bank performance measured by customer satisfaction, deposit mobilization and profit level. Therefore, your recommendation (characteristics on the bank) is not included in the scope of this study.  It quite unfortunate that you doubted our integrity. Please can you let us know the links to your published papers to confirm if you attached questionnaire (appendix) to all your published articles?  Please, note that this is not a thesis but article journal, therefore is not mandatory that questionnaire should be attached.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Literature resources are a bit outdated – mainly 2011 and older..	Your claim is not true. Go through the references again.

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