



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_33399
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PRACTICES IN THE BANKING INDUSTRY. THE CASE OF GHANA AND CHINA
Type of the Article	Case study

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Although topic and research problem looks acceptable, but methodology looks not sufficient to search to this kind of problem. "Secondary data from the banks website and Social Responsibility Report was 22 examined and compared."generally it may accept as contextual as report based research. Surely it is worthy but it may support with any other qualitative or quantitative method to strong data to convince more strong readers. So, this paper has considerable qualifications but methodology looks not acceptable, author may improve it. This is not mandatory it is just suggestion. I have read my interest. Regards,	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ayşe Kucuk Yilmaz</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Management and Strategy, Anadolu University, Turkey</i>