



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
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)
Compulsory 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	
Minor 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).	
Optional/General comments	Literature resources are a bit outdated – mainly 2011 and older.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pavel Bachmann
Department, University & Country	University of Hradec Kralove, Czech Republic