



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6409
Title of the Manuscript:	Achieving Best Practice In Nigerian Banking Sector Through Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Management
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>)



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	General Comments on ‘Achieving Best Practice In Nigerian Banking Sector Through Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Management.’ a) The title of the paper is not in agreement with the content. b) Conceptual and theoretical framework. a) There is no conceptual framework on ‘Best Practices’. This constituted problems later in Literature Review. b) There is also no theoretical framework on which the work is based. c) Literature Review. This aspect is not properly handled by the author(s). a) The most recent work reviewed is Wali	I also found the reviewer's comment here very objective as well. I have endeavoured to respond to them accordingly. Particularly the paper title, likewise the statement of hypotheses have been harmonised and the missing references have all been attended to in the corrected manuscript. On the issue of date, the work covers the period 1998-2011 in data used, in addition, now have a 2012 reference included in the study.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(2010). The work needs to be brought up-to-date. b) Some of the works cited in the body of the work are not included in the list of references. c) The bulk of the works in the list of references are not in the body of the work. d) The literatures reviewed are mainly on banks' profitability, interest margins, determinants of banks' profitability, output, performance etc. Research Hypothesis a) The research hypothesis stated on page 3 of the work is not in agreement with the one stated in other pages. b) The author(s) should justify the use of each of the variables used in the work. This can easily be done either by stating the superiority of each of them over other variables or by making references to previous	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	works that had used them for similar purpose. c) The choice of the period 1998-2012 used as a scope for the work need to be justified by the author(s). Why focus on that particular period? What is peculiar to the banking industry in that period? Discussions The author(s) has/have the right to conceal the raw data used for the work. The discussion will however be more robust if he/she/they can use descriptive statistics like graphs to illustrate the trends in each of the variables over the period to justify his/her/their findings. Volume of the work. The author(s) should kindly endeavor to reduce the total number of pages to not more than 15 tipages.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		