



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJEMT/1977
Title of the Manuscript:	CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AN OUTLOOK OF INDIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	While the literature review is overall solid, a couple of sentences seem to have been taken without citation from a call for papers for a special issue of the Social Responsibility Journal titled "CSR in BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) Countries" (http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors/writing/calls.htm?id=3395): lines 89-92 ("To date... of domestic firms") and 142-145 ("Recently a number... transition environments"). The authors ought to paraphrase these sentences and refer to the source, or if a direct quotation is preferred, use quotation marks and refer to the source. Regarding the methodology, I think it is important that the authors provide additional information about: 1) The way in which the sample was drawn. How exactly were respondents selected? And given that convenience samples were used, is there any indication that these samples are representative of their populations? 2) The exact questions and scales that were posed to respondents. In the current manuscript it is not exactly clear on what kind of scale the respondents rated CSR (Agreement? Performance? Satisfaction?), making it difficult to interpret the results.	Introduced this citation in the suggested lines of the article in two areas. The researchers adopted the necessary questionnaire from the article published in the SRJ which was cited in the article. Explained in-detail about these points in the methodology part of the article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It would be useful to provide some more explicit discussion of the nature of the gaps between the perceptions of managers and other stakeholders. While it seems clear that managers were overall much more positive than other stakeholders, for some attributes the gap seems to be much smaller. For example, managers and employees rate the company's performance on providing fair wages about equally	Researchers identified high degree of dissatisfaction from the employees community regarding this issue but employees are hesitating to reveal



SDI Review Form 1.6

	positive (80 and 74%, respectively). Also, the paper might benefit from some copy-editing. Here and there, there seem to be some linguistic errors or awkward formulations, e.g. lines 241-242 "... analysed using Microsoft Excel software and normal distribution" (a normal distribution is not an analysis method), line 374 "... through cross validate section", line 391 "rigorously working for keep in mind...".	their opinion freely because of fear or threat due to various reasons. These sentences restructured along with close observation of the remaining parts of the article.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an interesting paper on the attitudes of managers and various stakeholders regarding the CSR activities of Indian financial institutions. It offers useful insights in the gaps between how managers and stakeholders see the industry's actions.	Thanks for your compliment.