



Paper: “Impacts of Pandemics on Economy - Focusing on the Measures and Employee Performance in Banking Industry of Pakistan during COVID-19”

Corresponding Author: Rukhshinda Begum

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n16p13

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paul Waithaka
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Angela Gaizo
University of Napoli Parthenope, Italy

Reviewer 3: Onyeka Uche Ofili
ISM, Paris

Reviewer 4: Zaroug Osman Bilal
Dhofar University, Oman

Published: 30.06.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Paul Waithaka	Email:
University/Country: Kenyatta University/Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 07/05/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10/05/2020
Manuscript Title: A Study Discussing the Economic Impacts on Pandemics on the Banking Industry of Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0559/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>Remove the words “A study discussing” from the title of the paper</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

Yes the abstract clearly presents a summary of the paper but there need to improve sentence construction	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3.5
<i>Proofread the paper to eliminate grammatical errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The study methodology should be enhanced. It should provide details of tools used for data collection. Explain how respondents were selected</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	
<i>The discussion could be enriched by comparing the results with findings of previous studies</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Conclusions are okay but should also include recommendations that would help banks deal with other pandemics occurring in the future</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>In-text citations should be consistent. Reference list should be uniform. The first is in capital the other are not</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Onyeka Uche Ofili	Email:
University/Country: ISM, Paris	
Date Manuscript Received: May 29, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 31, 2020
Manuscript Title: Impacts of Pandemics on Economy - Focusing on the Measures and Employee Performance in Banking Industry of Pakistan during COVID-19	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0559/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
The title of the paper is much better. It reflects the essence of the research.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

The abstract captures the basic essence of the research.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The research methodology is simple and straightforward. This section has been greatly improved upon by the researcher.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3
The body of the paper is properly presented.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion is accurate and adequately supported by the research objectives and findings.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The researcher has taken into consideration my earlier observations and has improved the quality of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: May 13, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: May 21, 2020
Manuscript Title: Economic Impacts of Pandemics on the Banking Industry of Pakistan	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0559/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
The title of the research paper should be clearer. It should mention employees as the research appears to be geared more towards exploring the situation/condition of bank employees' during the pandemic.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	2

results.	
The abstract captures the basic essence of the research. However, the researchers' may wish to review the abstract ensuring that grammatical errors are eliminated and then possibly making it more concise and straight to the point.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
The research methodology is simple and straightforward. It will be appropriate if the researchers state the biases that could have arisen from interviewing the bank staff. And they should also mention other limitations encountered during the course of the research	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	2
Is the hypothesis on the impact of covid-19 on banks as institutions or its impact on individuals working in banks? You need to be clear on this.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
There should be consistency in the referencing style.	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The researchers should take some time to review the paper as per the comments above and resubmit.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: