



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_6167
Title of the Manuscript:	MEASURE AND DETERMINANTS OF BANKS' TRANSPARENCY IN EMERGING MARKETS
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	Link the source to the text, e.g. Barako (2007:13) opined or argued or submitted... 2. The introduction is too lengthy. There should be no subsection 3. Measure of Transparency (2) (2.1)(2.2)(2.3)(2.4)3....) should be summarily transferred to Methods and Materials section. 4. Empirical Results should be changed to Results and Discussions. 5. Conclusion should include Findings.	1. OK 2. introduction is modified (some parts are cancelled) and without subsection 3. The section of measure of transparency is summarized (suggestion of the second reviewer) and transferred to methodology. 4. we have add findings in conclusion
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Nil	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nil	