



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	1. The subject matter addressed in the paper is very important but the authors do not present the material in the better writing skills, grammar and spelling that would bring forth their contribution in understanding money laundering in Italy. They need someone to edit the paper BFORE it is ever sent out to reviewers. 2. For readers outside Italy, there is a need to provide a brief discussion of objectives of the decrees and directives cited in the paper. 3. Besides Table 1 and 2, the papers has very little empirical work. Thus, it does read like a simple newspaper story.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In Box 1, the following words seem to be basic spelling errors: phisically should be "physically;" tipically should be "typically;" and primis could be "premises."! 2. What does "analogue material" mean? 3. What is the "World Check"? 4. Font size on Section headings	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think the author(s) should address the writing portion. As currently written, the reader is left to imagine what the author intended. They should also improve the empirical portion. As currently presented, Tables 1 and 2 are far from satisfactory.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer