



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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The banking system plays an important role in the economy and has its specifics that significantly determine basic conditions of the commercial bank business. Between the most specific signs it can be assign: money as a subject of business, a typical structure of the commercial bank balance sheet and strict regulation of the banking sector. Necessary precondition for the optimal function of the banking system is his trustworthiness. In this context, it can be stated that article focuses on a current issue and has considerable informative value. The structure of article is properly constructed. Author examines the issue of transparency but it would be more useful to define what the author means by it. It would be appropriate to add that the structure of several sub-indexes is considerably subjective which may cause a formulation of not quite correct scientific opinions. In the article, well know methodological issue is occurred. Author is examined a relationship between variables through statistical methods. For example a relationship between ROE and the transparency has been investigated. The analyzed data showed that there is a statistically significant dependence of individual indicators but quality logical explanation of a dependence of both variables is missing. Ultimately this questionable approach has been confirmed by results of this study where dependence between ROE and ROA is fluctuated in opposite directions and therefore a precise explanation would be required. Therefore presented arguments cannot be considered as sufficient one. Nevertheless after minor adjustments this article could be published.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Heading of this article is not accurate. In the Abstract there is a grammatical error in the word Turkey. A sentence: The pillar tree of the new Basel Capital Accord (Basel 2)... is not correct, because there exist a Basel III. Author is using old citation sources. A sentence: In the period of crises, several papers (Nier, 2005; is not correct because effects of a financial crisis were reflected later. Aim of this article states to examine specific features of banking sector but the body of the article does not pay any attention to this issue. It is recommended to study a following article: BELÁS, J.: Social responsibility and ethics in banking business: Myth or reality? A case study from the Slovak Republic. In <i>Economic Annals</i>, Vol. LVII, No. 195. 2012. ISSN: 0013-3264. DOI: 10.2298/EKA1295115B. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) represents a concept that is discussed for a longer time but very popular in the financial sector it has become only during the crisis. CSR contains economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic expectations that society has in relation to the company. The issue of CSR is processed very superficially. It is necessary to accurately formulate your ideas. E.g. author argues that a government ownership of banks leads to a greater transparency. Experiences of transition countries in Central Europe are diametrically different etc.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer