



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_7266
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-Money Laundering System: Evidence from Italian Banks
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	It is very timely and important economy problem. The characteristic is that each individual phenomenon of anti-money laundering has the international implications, for what the authors point out in the part of literature review. In the introduction Authors declare that the aim of their work is to build a model of identifying organizational and culture dependences of anti-money laundering process. They also point that their work is making a contribution to the methodology of testing and evaluating this process. In turn to the title of the work it is rather expected a model and a description of the anti-money laundering system. Unfortunately I cannot find confirmation of any of these declarations in all work. There doesn't any model in this work. There is only a detailed statistical and descriptive presentation of the results of the survey. There is no wording of research questions / hypotheses, for which were sought responses during the research. In consequence the conclusions presented in the last chapter are very general nature, often simply commonsense. From these also results very superficial presentation of the methodological part, limited to a general description of the survey sample and survey research. The consequence of lack formulated hypotheses is the inability to make testing and assessing of their relevance. Therefore the declared contribution to the methodology of assessing research in the anti-money laundering area is also not supported in my opinion.	We modified the introduction trying to harmonize what is stated in this section with the contents of the rest of our paper. We eliminated the construction of a model among our research objectives.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are a few typing errors in the text. Title of the paper does not correspond with its contents sufficiently.	We corrected the errors. We changed the title.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work should be methodologically strengthened. Also it should realizing the model and method for assessing organizational, legal and cultural readiness to combat money laundering, declared in the introduction. Then the work will provide a significant contribution to the field of science and knowledge and will be applied in business and economic practice.	