

Paper: **“Banks and FinTech Relationship in a Digital Transformation Context”**

Submitted: 09 November 2021

Accepted: 06 April 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Jihane Tayazime

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p106](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n12p106)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rajko Odočaba
University of Osijek, Faculty of Law, Croatia

Reviewer 2: Vincenzo Riso
University of Ferrara, Italy

Reviewer 3: Nikolett Deutsch
Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the paper is clear and appropriate for the content of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Although the aim of the research and the results of the research, as well as the scientific methods used, can be clearly seen from the text of the paper, in the summary it was possible to state the goals of the research and the final results of the research in two additional sentences.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No significant grammatical and spelling errors were observed.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

In the introduction, the methodology is sufficiently indicated and explained, with the setting of two opposing hypotheses.
It is especially worth praising that when analyzing the results of indicative empirical research, the authors are very objective about its limitations.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The structure of the paper is clearly and qualitatively set, and no mistakes were made in the work in structuring, naming the chapters and subchapters, or in numerical marking.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

In conclusion, the insights gained in earlier chapters of the paper could be more broadly conveyed, and several new conclusions (e.g., about cyber threats) could find a place in earlier chapters.
Furthermore, although correctly stated, it is questionable whether citations should be cited in the conclusion.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Each in-text citation is not listed in the bibliography. That number is significant - it seems over 10, and their inclusion in the bibliography would improve the quality of the same, as well as the entire text.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be interesting for the authors in future research to pay attention to the impact of FinTechs on increasing / decreasing competition among financial sector entities, as well as to analyze the impact of FinTechs on employment rates in the financial sector.

Reviewer L:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the article is superficial, the manuscript deals only with a non-representative sample, no real business model innovation is examined in the paper. It is recommended for the author(s) to redefine the title with a narrower focus.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract does not contain the main goals and objects of the manuscript, it does not present the method and the results of the statistical analyses conducted. Own contribution to the previous literature should be highlighted.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Several grammatical errors and spelling mistakes can be found in the manuscript, a language check is recommended.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methodology used by the author is not explained clearly, variables and their scale are not presented. Only basic statistical methods are used, real statistical analysis fitting to the requirements of the journal is missing.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Due to the comments mentioned above, it is hard to evaluate the correctness of the methodology and the results.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Discussion should contain the examination of the current results in the light of previous ones. Moreover, since the analysis focuses only a questionnaire with non-representative sample, it is highly recommended for the author to avoid the overgeneralization of the statements.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Quotation and referencing do not meet the formal requirements.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

1

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper deals with an actual and interesting topic. Although the manuscript focuses only on the evaluation of a non-representative questionnaire, the title of the article suggests a broader scope of investigation. The abstract is not in line with the content of the paper, own contribution (goals, objectives, methodology used, sample, main conclusions) to the literature debate should be more emphasized. The structure of the article is logical and easy to follow. Literature review is acceptable, however in most of the cases literature review bases on the full repetition of a sentences, phrases of other authors without using the required indication (i.e., page numbers are missing). Regarding the sample, data and methodology used by the author, it should be noted that no real information can be found in the paper considering the sample and methodology, furthermore and more important, only basic statistical methods are applied. Due to these inconsistencies, it is hard to evaluate or judge the acceptance of the methodology and the results or these results have no real scientific importance. Discussion and conclusion sessions are far too general, comparison with previous

literature results is neglected. Quotation and referencing do not meet the formal requirements. In sum, the manuscript needs further improvement, major revisions, and resubmission.
