



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
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, corrects the manuscript and highlights that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The Abstract did not tell whether the objective of the study was achieved or not. The Introduction did not explicitly identify the need for the research. Although the literature review mentioned it in part in lines 133 to 136. The introduction should be explicit in identifying the need for the study. Line 31 has some editorial challenges. Revisit it. Line 68- Explain Vernacular used in the work '<i>pecunia non olet</i>' Review of literature did not address the objectives of the study and did not clearly show the research gap to fill and the contribution to knowledge. Methodology – the author did another round of literature review. Literature review issues were included in the methodology.	The abstract has been modified according to the revisions made into the introduction. Even the description of our objective has changed in the new version of the abstract. We have formulated the need for the research in another way. We have eliminated the part containing the expression "pecunia non olet". We have enriched the literature review trying also to specify better the contribution of our research.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The Objective two is not a research objective but a research methodology and it seems unrealistic to achieve through just the sending of questionnaire. The paper did not specify results of analysis against what the authors had already indicated at the introduction.	We have modified our research objectives in accordance with the comments received. We have harmonized the research objectives with the results.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Author should harmonise the objectives of the paper with the results/conclusion.	