



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_19852
Title of the Manuscript:	Corporate Governance and Business Ethics structural failures for Kingdom Bank Africa Limited (KBAL) Botswana
Type of the Article	Scientific study – Business and Management

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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The title should be written as follow: Corporate Governance and Business Ethics Structural Failure for Kingdom Bank Africa Limited (KBAL) Botswana. Instead of: Corporate governance and business ethics structural failure for Kingdom Bank Africa Limited (KBAL) Botswana - The research work did not review concepts and related existing studies (empirical literature). The study needs to carry out literature review which must be in the second section of the research paper. - The citation is not appropriate by the use of www. Sundaymail.co.zw in line 44, 49 and 55. If the source of the information is online newspaper it is better to use the name of the author or editor follows by year. The link only needs to be written along with the author's/ editor's name, year of publication, and the title of the write-up in the reference at the end of the paper. - The agency theory the study claimed it adopted must be discussed under the theoretical literature of the literature review in section 2.	Amended Literature reviewed, please relook again Amended No Amended. Its rather optional



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- The methodology should be third section of the paper. The research objectives along with problem statement were well stated at the introduction stage. But, there is no research question and hypothesis which are part of the methodology. - The study needs to interpret the statistical results obtained. (the F-stat of two sample variance needs to be interpreted along with the other parameters in the result) The findings of the work do not emanate from any hypothesis tested through statistical analysis, despite the fact that the study adopted survey research design. The responses of the respondents need to be analysed, interpreted and tested through formulation of hypothesis. - The study proffers no recommendation. Policy recommendation needs to be made for study like this. In view of the foregoing, the researcher should try and make sure that his or her research work is structure as follows: - INTRODUCTION - LITERATURE REVIEW (conceptual review, theoretical review and empirical review) - METHODOLOGY - DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION - DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	No Amendment. We added research questions. Please note No need or requirement for Hypotheses if there are questions Amended. Further simplified and Interpreted No Amendment. Recommendations were made already No Amendment. The standard journal recommended format was used, which still works the same as your recommendation
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 63 and 67, there is need for author to correct the grammar. 'Management practices seems was evidently deficient', 'seems to be have been ...' respectively.	Amended
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The abstract which is an executive summary need not to capture all the details of the work. The most important of the finding should be documented in the abstract. It is not compulsory to write all the findings in the abstract.	