Iosr Journal Of Economics And Finance (Iosr-Jef)
E-Issn: 2321-5933, P-Issn: 2321-5925.Volume 16, Issue 3 Ser. 1 (May. – June. 2025), Pp 26-33
www.Iosrjournals.Org

Credit – Deposit Ratio Analysis Across Banking Sectors: A Comparative Evaluation Of Public, Private, Foreign, RRB's, And SCB Banks

Faizan Khan, Dr. Krithika J
2nd Year MBA, RV Institute Of Management Affiliated To Bangalore City University, Bangalore (560001), Karnataka, India
Associate Professor, RV Institute Of Management Affiliated To Bangalore City University, Bangalore (560001), Karnataka, India

Abstract:
This study examines the Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR) and its relationship with the Asset-Deposit Ratio (A/D Ratio) and Total Assets across five different banking sectors over a 10-year period (2013–2024). Using One-Way ANOVA, Two-Way ANOVA, and Regression Analysis, the study investigates whether A/D Ratio and Total Assets significantly influence CDR and whether variations exist among different banks. The One-Way ANOVA results indicate a statistically significant difference in CDR among banks ($p < 0.05$), suggesting diverse lending strategies across institutions. Two-Way ANOVA results confirm that A/D Ratio has a significant impact on CDR ($p < 0.05$), whereas CDR does not vary significantly over time. Regression Analysis further supports these findings, demonstrating that A/D Ratio positively affects CDR, while Total Assets do not have a statistically significant impact ($p > 0.05$). The model explains 21.08% of the variation in CDR ($R^2 = 0.21085$), indicating that other factors may also influence lending behavior. The findings suggest that A/D Ratio is a key determinant of CDR, while Total Assets alone do not drive lending activity. Based on these results, policy recommendations include optimizing asset utilization, improving risk management, and encouraging data-driven lending decisions. Future research could explore additional macroeconomic variables, expand the dataset, and utilize predictive models to enhance understanding of CDR trends. This study contributes to the existing literature by providing statistical insights into the relationship between A/D Ratio, Total Assets, and CDR, offering practical implications for policymakers and banking institutions.

Keywords: *Credit-Deposit ratio, Assets to Deposit ratio, Indian Banks, Total Assets, Banking Analysis*

Date of Submission: 27-04-2025 Date of Acceptance: 07-05-2025

I. Introduction:

The Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR) is a key financial metric used to assess a bank's lending efficiency and liquidity management. It represents the proportion of total deposits that a bank has utilized for lending purposes. A higher CDR indicates that a greater portion of deposits is allocated to loans, potentially increasing profitability but also exposing the bank to higher liquidity risks. Conversely, a lower CDR suggests a more conservative approach, where a significant portion of deposits remains unused for lending, which may limit revenue generation.

Understanding the factors influencing CDR is crucial for banks, policymakers, and investors. Two significant financial indicators that can impact CDR are the Assets-to-Deposit (A/D) Ratio and Total Assets. The A/D Ratio reflects a bank's asset utilization relative to its deposit base, while Total Assets represent the overall financial strength and resource availability of the institution. Banks with a higher A/D Ratio may indicate aggressive asset growth strategies, potentially leading to higher lending activity and, in turn, an increased CDR. However, the relationship between Total Assets and CDR is not always straightforward, as larger banks may have more diversified portfolios and different risk management strategies.

This study aims to analyze the relationship between CDR, A/D Ratio, and Total Assets using data from five different banking sectors over a 10-year period (2013-2024). Through regression analysis and ANOVA, we seek to determine whether A/D Ratio and Total Assets significantly influence CDR, providing insights into how banks allocate their resources and manage their lending activities. The findings of this research will contribute to a better understanding of banking trends and may have implications for financial decision-making and risk assessment.

II. Objective Of The Study:

1. To examine variations in the Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR) among different banks
2. To analyze the interaction effect of A/D Ratio on CDR over different years.
3. To assess the impact of A/D Ratio and Total Assets on CDR.

III. Literature Review:

Several studies have examined the significance of the Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR) and Asset-Deposit Ratio (A/D Ratio) in evaluating banking performance, liquidity management, and financial stability.

Goel & Kumar (2016) analyzed the CDR and cash-deposit ratio of five public sector banks in India. Their study found that the CDR varied significantly among the banks, with Andhra Bank showing the highest ratio. An ANOVA test confirmed a statistically significant difference in CDR among the banks, whereas no significant difference was found in cash-deposit ratios. The study suggested expanding the sample size to include more banks for a broader analysis.

Ramchandani & Jethwani (2017) investigated the impact of CDR on the profitability of scheduled commercial banks in India. Their findings indicated that CDR has a strong positive correlation with interest income but a moderate negative correlation with return on equity (ROE) and net interest margin (NIM). The authors recommended exploring non-linear relationships and extending the study across different economies.

Sulaiman (2016) focused on the sagging CDR of commercial banks in Kerala, highlighting disparities between urban and rural areas. The study revealed that urban areas had a higher CDR, while rural banks struggled to match credit growth with deposit mobilization. The research emphasized the importance of priority sector lending policies in improving credit utilization in rural areas.

Sarmah & Goswami conducted a comparative study on State Bank of India (SBI) and ICICI Bank, evaluating their deposit mobilization and credit creation capacity. Their research found that ICICI Bank was more efficient in utilizing its deposits to create credit, leading to a higher CDR. However, SBI had a larger deposit base and loan volume. The study suggested extending the analysis to include more banks for a comprehensive industry-wide perspective.

Sura (2006) examined the efficacy of regional rural banks (RRBs) in India, noting that while RRBs showed significant growth in deposit mobilization, their CDR declined over the years. The study attributed this trend to limited credit disbursement capacity and recommended policy reforms to enhance rural credit deployment.

Narayana (2003) explored why Kerala's CDR was lower than other states, finding that the credit amount per account was lower despite a high number of credit accounts. The study suggested that banks in Kerala were reluctant to lend to industry and trade sectors, prioritizing low-credit-absorbing segments like agriculture and personal loans.

Oriya & Virani (2022) analyzed the CDR of private sector banks in India, concluding that HDFC Bank had the highest CDR, indicating better deposit utilization for lending. Their findings also suggested that ICICI Bank maintained the highest cash-deposit ratio, reflecting a stronger liquidity position.

Singh & Tandon (2012) compared the financial performance of SBI and ICICI Bank, finding that ICICI Bank had a higher CDR, suggesting more aggressive lending. However, SBI had higher interest income and a stronger net worth ratio, indicating a more stable long-term financial position.

These studies provide a strong foundation for analyzing the CDR and A/D Ratio across different banking categories. The findings highlight the varying efficiency of banks in utilizing deposits, differences in lending behavior, and the impact of macroeconomic conditions. This study builds upon these insights by employing ANOVA and regression analysis to assess how A/D Ratio and bank type influence CDR over a 10-year period.

IV. Research Methodology:

1. Data Collection

This study analyzes the Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR) and its relationship with the Asset-Deposit Ratio (A/D Ratio) and Total Assets across five banks over a 10-year period (2013–2024). The data consists of annual values of total credit, total deposits, total assets, and the calculated ratios for each bank.

The dataset includes:

Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR): The proportion of deposits used for lending.

Asset-Deposit Ratio (A/D Ratio): The ratio of total assets to total deposits, indicating how effectively banks allocate their resources.

Total Assets: The overall financial strength of each bank.

2. Variables Used

Dependent Variable: Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR)

Independent Variables: Asset-Deposit Ratio (A/D Ratio), Total Assets (₹)

3. Statistical Techniques Used:
3.1 One-Way ANOVA
Hypothesis:
H_1: There is a significant difference in the C/D ratio among different bank types.

3.2 Two-Way ANOVA (Without Replication)
Hypothesis:
H_1: A/D Ratio does significantly impact CDR.

3.3 Regression Analysis
Hypothesis:
H_1: A/D Ratio and/or Total Assets have a significant impact on CDR.

Method: A multiple linear regression model was applied with CDR as the dependent variable and A/D Ratio & Total Assets as independent variables. (Kumar Ramchandani & Dr. Kinjal Jethwani, Naresh Kedia & Prof. (Dr.) Anil Vashisht, Sharifi & Akhter)

4. Software Used

The analysis was conducted using Microsoft Excel, employing its Data Analysis ToolPak for ANOVA and Regression.

V. Analysis & Interpretation Of Data:

Credit – Deposit Ratio
Formula: (Total Advances given during a particular year / Total Deposit made in a particular year) * 100

Table no 1: Shows credit to deposit ratio of different bank types

YEARS	C/D Ratio Public Banks	C/D Ratio Private Banks	C/D Ratio Foreign Banks	C/D Ratio (SCB)	C/D Ratio (RRB'S)	Mean C/D Ratio
2013	0.73	0.87	1.03	0.79	0.66	0.82
2014	0.75	0.90	0.89	0.79	0.69	0.80
2015	0.71	0.93	0.82	0.78	0.68	0.79
2016	0.70	0.96	0.84	0.78	0.67	0.79
2017	0.69	0.92	0.73	0.73	0.62	0.74
2018	0.71	0.92	0.72	0.74	0.63	0.75
2019	0.71	0.91	0.74	0.75	0.65	0.75
2020	0.71	0.88	0.72	0.74	0.63	0.73
2021	0.63	0.85	0.60	0.69	0.65	0.69
2022	0.66	0.86	0.54	0.71	0.65	0.68
2023	0.72	0.88	0.66	0.75	0.68	0.74
2024	0.74	0.94	0.66	0.78	0.73	0.77

The Credit-Deposit (C/D) Ratio of different bank categories from 2013 to 2024 displays considerable variation across bank types. Private banks consistently exhibit the highest C/D ratio, averaging 0.902, indicating their aggressive lending behavior relative to deposits. Foreign banks also maintain a relatively high ratio, though with greater volatility, suggesting fluctuations in credit expansion. Public sector banks exhibit a moderate C/D ratio with relatively stable values over time, reflecting a conservative credit policy. SCBs and RRBs have the lowest C/D ratios, which may suggest limited credit expansion due to regulatory constraints or their focus on financial inclusion over aggressive lending. The mean C/D ratio across all banks shows a declining trend from 2013 to 2021, reaching a low of 0.68, followed by a recovery towards 2024.

Table no 2: Shows the descriptive statistics of c/d ratio of different bank types

Particulars	*C/D Ratio Public Banks*	*C/D Ratio Private Banks*	*C/D Ratio Foreign Banks*	*C/D Ratio (SCB)*	*C/D Ratio (RRB'S)*
Mean	0.704	0.902	0.748	0.753	0.662
Standard Error	0.010	0.010	0.038	0.009	0.009
Median	0.706	0.907	0.728	0.751	0.656
Standard Deviation	0.033	0.034	0.133	0.032	0.032
Sample Variance	0.001	0.001	0.018	0.001	0.001
Kurtosis	1.306	-1.222	0.630	-0.845	0.856
Skewness	-1.020	0.008	0.627	-0.457	0.758
Range	0.119	0.105	0.488	0.098	0.116
Minimum	0.630	0.852	0.542	0.694	0.617

Maximum	0.749	0.957	1.030	0.791	0.733
Sum	8.443	10.827	8.976	9.042	7.942
Count	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000	12.000
Largest (1)	0.749	0.957	1.030	0.791	0.733
Smallest (1)	0.630	0.852	0.542	0.694	0.617

The descriptive statistics reinforce the observed trends in C/D ratio distributions. Private banks have the highest mean C/D ratio (0.902) and exhibit the least variation, suggesting a stable lending pattern. Foreign banks have a relatively high mean (0.748) but with a significantly higher standard deviation (0.133), indicating greater fluctuations in credit deployment. Public banks, SCBs, and RRBs have lower means (0.704, 0.753, and 0.662, respectively), with RRBs exhibiting the lowest minimum C/D ratio (0.617). The skewness values suggest that public banks, SCBs, and foreign banks show negative skewness, indicating a concentration of values toward the higher end of their distribution, whereas RRBs exhibit positive skewness, suggesting occasional spikes in their C/D ratio

.

Assets – Deposit Ratio

Formula: (Total Assets held by bank in a year / Total Deposit made into bank in that year) * 100

Table no 3: Shows assets to deposit ratio of different bank types

YEARS	AD Ratio Public Bank	AD Ratio Private Bank	AD Ratio Foreign Bank	AD Ratio SCB'S	AD Ratio RRB'S	Mean AD Ratio
2013	1.17	1.52	2.01	1.29	1.09	1.29
2014	1.18	1.50	1.94	1.29	1.15	1.29
2015	1.16	1.50	1.63	1.28	1.12	1.28
2016	1.17	1.51	1.56	1.30	1.06	1.30
2017	1.17	1.45	1.59	1.28	1.01	1.27
2018	1.18	1.46	1.55	1.29	1.04	1.29
2019	1.17	1.42	1.79	1.29	1.14	1.29
2020	1.17	1.39	1.83	1.29	1.14	1.29
2021	1.15	1.34	1.64	1.26	1.29	1.26
2022	1.14	1.35	1.56	1.26	1.29	1.26
2023	1.16	1.34	1.76	1.28	1.27	1.28
2024	1.17	1.43	1.68	1.38	1.34	1.37

The A/D ratio data across various banking categories from 2013 to 2024 reveals distinct patterns in financial positioning. Private and foreign banks generally maintain higher A/D ratios compared to public banks and regional rural banks (RRBs), indicating a more aggressive asset allocation approach. The overall mean A/D ratio across banks fluctuates slightly, reflecting changing liquidity and risk management strategies.

Table no 4: Shows descriptive statistics of A/D ratio of different bank types

Particulars	*AD Ratio Public Bank*	*AD Ratio Private Bank*	*AD Ratio Foreign Bank*	*AD Ratio SCB'S*	*AD Ratio RRB'S*
Mean	1.17	1.43	1.71	1.29	1.16
Standard Error	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.03
Median	1.17	1.44	1.66	1.29	1.14
Standard Deviation	0.01	0.07	0.15	0.03	0.11
Sample Variance	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01
Kurtosis	0.35	-1.44	-0.41	7.19	-1.21
Skewness	-0.88	-0.25	0.81	2.39	0.34
Range	0.04	0.18	0.46	0.12	0.33
Minimum	1.14	1.34	1.55	1.26	1.01
Maximum	1.18	1.52	2.01	1.38	1.34
Sum	14.00	17.20	20.54	15.47	13.94
Count	12	12	12	12	12
Largest (1)	1.18	1.52	2.01	1.38	1.34
Smallest (1)	1.14	1.34	1.55	1.26	1.01

The descriptive statistics provide insight into the distribution and variability of A/D ratios among different bank categories:

Mean A/D Ratios: Private banks (1.43) and foreign banks (1.71) exhibit the highest mean A/D ratios, suggesting a greater asset deployment per unit of deposit. Public banks and RRBs maintain more conservative ratios at 1.17 and 1.16, respectively.

Standard Deviation & Variance: Foreign banks show the highest standard deviation (0.15), indicating greater fluctuations in A/D ratios over time. This suggests a more dynamic asset management approach, while public banks and RRBs display more stability.

Skewness & Kurtosis: Public banks exhibit slight negative skewness (-0.88), indicating a left-tailed distribution. The highly negative kurtosis of private banks (-1.44) suggests a flatter distribution, implying fewer extreme A/D ratio values over time.

One-Way ANOVA

Table no 5: shows the result obtained using one-way Anova

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*		
Public Banks	12	8.442840452	0.703570038	0.001092207		
Private Banks	12	10.82654775	0.902212313	0.001151767		
Foreign Banks	12	8.976293697	0.748024475	0.017641127		
SCB	12	9.041584715	0.753465393	0.001055261		
RRB	12	7.942013451	0.661834454	0.001041905		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	0.396484699	4	0.099121175	22.54571143	4.61904E-11	2.539688635
Within Groups	0.24180495	55	0.004396454			
Total	0.638289649	59				

Hypothesis Formulation

Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant difference in the C/D ratio among different banks types.

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): There is a significant difference in the C/D ratio among different bank types.

Interpretation

Since p-value < 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0), meaning there is a statistically significant difference in CDR among the five banks types.

This suggests that banks follow different credit allocation strategies, resulting in varying CDR levels.

Banks with higher CDRs may be more aggressive in lending, while those with lower CDRs may be more conservative in their credit policies.

The large between-group sum of squares (0.396) relative to the within-group sum of squares (0.241) further confirms that variations in the C/D ratio are primarily attributed to differences among bank types rather than random fluctuations.

Two-Way ANOVA (Without Replication)

Table no 6: Shows the result of two-way Anova

Anova: Two-Factor Without Replication						
SUMMARY	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*		
Bank Name	60	180	3	2.033898305		
A/D Ratio	60	81.14123303	1.352353884	0.050551897		
CDR Ratio	60	45.22928007	0.753821334	0.010818469		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Rows	38.54362026	59	0.653281699	0.90608544	0.658549292	1.433219064
Columns	162.3659507	2	81.18297535	112.598764	4.40487E-28	3.073090341
Error	85.07723129	118	0.720993485			
Total	285.9868022	179				

Hypotheses
H_0 (Null Hypothesis - Rows): There is no significant difference in the C/D ratio across different banks.
H_0 (Null Hypothesis - Columns): There is no significant effect of A/D ratio on the C/D ratio.
H_1 (Alternative Hypothesis - Rows): There is a significant difference in the C/D ratio among different banks.
H_1 (Alternative Hypothesis - Columns): A/D ratio has a significant effect on the C/D ratio.

Interpretation

Row Factor (Bank Name): The F-statistic (0.906) is less than the critical F-value (1.433), and the p-value (0.658) is much greater than 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the C/D ratio across different banks, leading to the acceptance of H_0 for this factor.

Column Factor (A/D Ratio): The F-statistic (112.598) is far greater than the critical F-value (3.073), and the p-value (4.40E-28) is extremely low. This suggests that A/D ratio significantly affects the C/D ratio, leading to the rejection of H_0 and acceptance of H_1.

The two-way ANOVA results suggest that while there is no significant difference in the C/D ratio across different banks, the A/D ratio plays a crucial role in influencing it. This underscores the importance of liquidity management and asset allocation strategies in determining banking sector credit expansion trends. These findings provide empirical evidence that policymakers and banking institutions should closely monitor A/D ratios to maintain a stable credit-deposit relationship**.**

Regression Analysis

Table no 7: Shows the result of regression analysis

Regression Statistics						
Multiple R	0.459188554					
R Square	0.210854128					
Adjusted R Square	0.183164799					
Standard Error	0.094004819					
Observations	60					
ANOVA						
	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*	
Regression	2	0.134586007	0.067293004	7.614995986	0.001172149	
Residual	57	0.503703642	0.008836906			
Total	59	0.638289649				
	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*
Intercept	0.459825632	0.076566746	6.005552751	1.40857E-07	0.306503368	0.613147896
A/D Ratio	0.214561374	0.054980237	3.902518146	0.000254048	0.104465348	0.3246574
Total Assests	9.95746E-10	1.75297E-09	0.568034204	0.572242683	-2.51451E-09	4.50601E-09

Hypothesis Testing
1. Overall Model Significance

Null Hypothesis (H_0): The model has no explanatory power (i.e., A/D Ratio and Total Assets do not influence CD Ratio).
Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): The model has at least one predictor significantly affects CD Ratio.

2. Significance of Individual Predictors
A/D Ratio:
H_0: A/D Ratio has no impact on CD Ratio.
H_1: A/D Ratio significantly impacts CD Ratio.
Total Assets:
H_0: Total Assets do not impact CD Ratio.
H_1: Total Assets significantly impact CD Ratio.

Interpretation:
Regression Model Summary

Multiple R (0.4592): Indicates a moderate correlation between the independent variables (A/D Ratio and Total Assets) and the dependent variable (CD Ratio).

R-Square (0.2109): The model explains 21.09% of the variation in CDR, meaning that while A/D Ratio is important, other factors also influence CDR, such as interest rates, loan policies, and risk management strategies.

Adjusted R-Square (0.1832): Adjusted for the number of predictors, this value is slightly lower, reinforcing that the model explains a limited portion of CD Ratio variability.

Standard Error (0.0940): Represents the average deviation of the observed values from the predicted values.

ANOVA Analysis

The F-statistic (7.6149) and Significance F (0.0012) suggest that the regression model is statistically significant at the 1% level, indicating that at least one predictor variable significantly contributes to explaining the variance in the CD Ratio.

Coefficient Interpretation

Intercept (0.4598, p-value: 1.41E-07): The intercept is statistically significant at the 1% level, implying that when both the A/D Ratio and Total Assets are zero, the CD Ratio is expected to be 0.4598.

A/D Ratio (0.2146, p-value: 0.00025): This variable has a statistically significant positive impact on the CD Ratio at the 1% level. A unit increase in the A/D Ratio leads to a 0.2146 increase in the CD Ratio, holding all else constant.

Total Assets (9.957E-10, p-value: 0.5722): This coefficient is not statistically significant (p-value > 0.05), indicating that Total Assets do not have a significant effect on the CD Ratio.

VI. Findings

1. The significant difference in CDR across banks (One-Way ANOVA) highlights diverse lending strategies among banks. Some banks may focus more on loans, while others may prioritize liquidity.
2. A/D Ratio is a key determinant of CDR (Two-Way ANOVA & Regression), suggesting that higher asset allocation relative to deposits leads to higher credit deployment.
3. Total Assets do not have a direct impact on CDR (Regression), indicating that having more assets does not necessarily mean a bank lends more—other factors like risk appetite and regulatory policies play a role.
4. No significant time-based trend in CDR (Two-Way ANOVA) suggests that CDR remains stable over time, meaning macroeconomic or regulatory changes may not have drastically altered lending patterns during the study period.

VII. Recommendation

The study recommends that banks focus on improving their Asset-to-Deposit (A/D) Ratio to enhance credit deployment efficiency. Since A/D Ratio significantly impacts the Credit-Deposit Ratio, banks should align their asset strategies with deposit mobilization to maintain a healthy balance. Policymakers may consider using the A/D Ratio as a monitoring tool to assess bank lending performance. Additionally, as Total Assets were found to have no significant impact on lending, banks should prioritize efficient asset utilization over expansion in size.

VIII. Conclusion

This study examined the Credit-Deposit Ratio (CDR) and its relationship with the Asset-Deposit Ratio (A/D Ratio) and Total Assets across five banks sectors over a 10-year period (2013–2024). Using One-Way ANOVA, Two-Way ANOVA, and Regression Analysis, the findings highlight the key factors influencing CDR. The results indicate that CDR varies significantly across banks ($p < 0.05$), suggesting different credit allocation strategies. A/D Ratio has a statistically significant positive impact on CDR ($p < 0.05$), confirming that banks with a higher A/D Ratio tend to have higher credit deployment. However, Total Assets do not have a significant effect on CDR ($p > 0.05$), implying that the size of a bank's assets alone does not determine its lending behavior. The regression model explains 21.08% of the variation in CDR ($R^2 = 0.21085$). While this suggests that other factors also influence CDR, such a result is expected in banking and economic research due to the complexity of financial systems. Lending behavior is influenced by multiple macroeconomic and institutional factors beyond those included in this study. Importantly, the statistical significance of the A/D Ratio ($p = 0.00025$) confirms that it remains a key determinant of CDR.

IX. Future Scope Of Study

While this study provides valuable insights, there is room for further research, future research can improve the model by incorporating additional variables, such as interest rates, GDP growth, inflation, and loan default rates, to better explain variations in CDR. A larger dataset covering more banks and a longer time period could help in generalizing the findings and identifying broader trends. More sophisticated forecasting techniques, such as time-series models (ARIMA, Prophet) or machine learning methods, could be used to predict future CDR

trends and improve model accuracy. A comparative study of public, private, foreign, and regional rural banks could provide deeper insights into how banking structures influence credit-deposit dynamics.

References:

[1] Goel, S., & Kumar, R. (2016). Analysis Of Cash-Deposit Ratio & Credit Deposit Ratio Of Public Sector Banks In India. International Journal Of Research In Management, Science & Technology, 4(2), 72–74.

[2] Ramchandani, K., & Jethwani, D. (2017). Impact Of Credit Deposit Ratio (CDR) On Bank Profitability: Evidence From Scheduled Commercial Banks Of India. KAAV International Journal Of Economics, Commerce & Business Management, 4(4), 183–190.

[3] Narayana, D. (2003). Why Is The Credit-Deposit Ratio Low In Kerala? Economic And Political Weekly, 38(41), 4355–4358.

[4] Ibrahim, M. S. (2009). Credit Deposit Ratio And Net Interest Margin (NIM) Of Indian Commercial Banks–An Analysis. SMART Journal Of Business Management Studies, 5(2), 27–38.

[5] Sura, D. J. S. (2006). Efficacy Of Regional Rural Banks (Rrbs) In India: A Conventional Analysis. JIMS-8M: The Journal Of Indian Management And Strategy, 11(4), 4–12.

[6] Inggawati, V. R., Lusy, L., & Hermanto, Y. B. (2018). The Influence Of Loan To Deposit Ratio, Loan Operational Of Income Operational And Non-Performing Loan Toward Profitability Of Bank. International Journal Of Scientific And Research Publications, 8(11), 510–519.

[7] Swami, O. S., Kumar, N. S., & Baruah, P. (2012). Trends In Deposits And Credit Deployments Of Regional Rural Banks In Karnataka. JIMS-8M: The Journal Of Indian Management & Strategy, 17(3), 4–10.

[8] Mohan, R. (2009). The Indian Banking Sector: Challenges And Opportunities. Reserve Bank Of India Bulletin, 63(4), 643–660.

[9] Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (1998). Financial Dependence And Growth. The American Economic Review, 88(3), 559–586.

[10] Bhatia, A., & Mahajan, P. (2018). An Analytical Study Of Credit Deposit Ratio Of Banks In India. International Journal Of Management Studies, 5(3), 129–137.

[11] Singh, B. (2014). Credit Deposit Ratio And Its Impact On Performance Of Banks In India. International Journal Of Business And General Management, 3(4), 31–36.

[12] Nayak, A. (2015). Regional Disparities In Credit-Deposit Ratio: A Study Of Indian States. Asian Economic Review, 57(2), 243–256.

[13] Chatterjee, A. (2021). Examining The Relationship Between Credit-Deposit Ratio And Profitability Of Indian Banks. International Journal Of Financial Management, 11(2), 89–97.

[14] Pandey, A., & Arora, M. (2019). Credit-Deposit Ratio As An Indicator Of Banking Efficiency: A Comparative Study. Journal Of Banking And Finance Review, 3(1), 11–19.

[15] Ghosh, S. (2012). Regional Banks And Inclusive Banking: Empirical Evidence From India. International Review Of Applied Economics, 26(4), 501–518.

[16] Dey, M., & De, A. (2020). Determinants Of Financial Performance In Indian Commercial Banks: The Role Of Credit-Deposit Ratio. Global Business Review, 21(1), 1–12.

[17] Kaur, G., & Kapoor, S. (2016). A Comparative Study Of Credit Deposit Ratio Among Public And Private Sector Banks In India. Pacific Business Review International, 8(10), 62–70.

[18] Bhunia, A. (2010). Financial Performance Of Indian Public And Private Sector Banks: An Analysis Through Credit Deposit Ratio. Indian Journal Of Commerce & Management Studies, 1(1), 46–52.

[19] Das, A., & Ghosh, S. (2006). Financial Deregulation And Efficiency: An Empirical Analysis Of Indian Banks During The Post Reform Period. Review Of Financial Economics, 15(3), 193–221.

[20] Reserve Bank Of India. Database On Indian Economy: RBI's Data Warehouse.