

# Review of: "Innovative Financial Services and Commercial Banks' Profitability in Africa"

Kennedy Nyabuto Ocharo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Embu

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The abstract is okay.

1. Introduction: The citation in the background is not consistent. For instance, in parenthesis the authors have (Chauhan, Akhtar, and Gupta, 2022), (Yusheng and Ibrahim, 2019) and (Medyawait, Yunouto, M., Hegarins, 2012). Statement like "Please note ..." can be replaced with "It can be observed that ...". Whereas the authors refer to only one study (Adeiza et al., 2022), they proceed to indicate that "These studies ..." instead of "This study ...". There is a statement which indicates that "... it is important to conduct a comparative literature review to identify specific research gaps in the African context". This study is not about comparative literature review, neither has this been. The study adopted five theories. Just list the theories instead of listing them after the statement "such as ...". The motivation of this study which should be found in the introduction is not clear. The statement of the problem (research gap) has not come out clearly in the background. The background has brought out other determinants of bank profitability (market conditions, regulatory frameworks and economic development levels), which should have come in as control variables but were not brought in the analysis.
2. Review of Literature: In section 2.1, the authors have indicated that there are various measure of profitability (gross profit margin, net profit margin, EBITDA, ROA, ROE). What is the justification for dropping all the rest and using only ROA? There is a repetition of statements, for instance "Measure of profitability ...". In section 2.2, what was the basis of picking only three innovation services? There is a repetition of the sentences "The relationship between mobile banking and profitability ...". Section 2.3, should have come first before section 2.2. The authors have shown how the theories are linked to the current study (Is it to the variables or methodology used in the study) The bringing in of new technologies such as cryptocurrency could added more value to this study. In section 2.4, the authors talk of four (4) independent variables but there are only three. They further talk of "teachers' job satisfaction as the dependent variable" and yet the dependent variable is bank performance. They need to check on this. In section 2.5, the authors have come out with review gaps, yet they have only reviews two articles in Africa (Agolla et al., 2018 in Botswana and Adeiza et al., 2022 in Nigeria).
3. Methods: There authors have done a lot of definitions than going for the required information. For instance, the authors just need to indicate the research approach, the research design that they have used, and not giving the definitions and examples of research approaches and designs.
4. Results: This section is well done. However, why did the authors find it unnecessary to have other determinants of bank profitability? How did they arrive at ROA as the best measure of bank profitability?

5. Discussion: The opening remarks are not necessary. From Table 9 all the P-values are 0.0000. So the P-values of 0.008 for mobile banking and internet banking introduced in section are wrong (unless the P-values in the Table are wrong). How the finding supports the theories is not clear in this discussion.
6. Getting the information on the effect of innovation services on customer satisfaction and bank performance may give misleading information. Whereas the information on bank performance can be gotten from bank managers, information on customer satisfaction can only be gotten from customers.