



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJEMT_12321
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies of the Evaluation of Green Financial Performance System with Comparative Analysis of China's Eight Economic Regions
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	1. Data were only up to the year 2008. If possible try to include at least upto 2010-11 2. Title "Studies of the Evaluation of Green Financial Performance System with Comparative Analysis of China's Eight Economic Regions" of the study gives the impression that the authors conducted an evaluation study of the studies conducted on Green Financial Performance System. But it is not actually the case. So it is better to put the title as Evaluation of Green Financial Performance System with Comparative Analysis of China's Eight Economic Regions 3. Objective of the study is given as last part of the literature review, but it is to be given as a separate heading before model specification 4. Methodology of the study, even though mentioned, is not very clear and rigorous in presentation. So it can be mentioned after the objectives in another heading	1. Green financial data is only available up until 2009 currently, for the calculation using this paper's methodology, the result is shown one year earlier. 2. Modified according to reviewer's suggestion. 3. Modified according to reviewer's suggestion. 4. The details of methodology are illustrated in other published papers by the author and other colleagues. References are also provided.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In several places it is written as We analysed, we investigated etc. The research paper should not use I we etc. Instead it can be written as the researcher, or the investigator 2. Instead of putting literature under the heading literature research, it can be given as literature review	1. Modified according to reviewer's suggestion. 2. Modified according to reviewer's suggestion.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		