

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_110023</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Quantitative Analysis and Comparative Review of Dividend Policy Dynamics within the Banking Sector: Insights from Global and U.S. Financial Data and Existing Literature</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, There are many reasons why manuscripts are important. They are a valuable source of information for historians and researchers and can provide insights into the past that would otherwise be lost. Manuscripts can also be beautiful works of art, and their value as cultural artifacts is immeasurable.</p> <p>2. It is in accordance with the contents of the entire paper</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article provides a brief overview of the paper's content, including its focus on a comparative review of academic research on dividend policies and payments within the banking sector, the importance of dividends for bank capital levels, profitability, regulatory compliance, and investors signaling, and the literature reviewed spanning pre- and post-2008 financial crisis periods and adopting both global and emerging market perspectives. Based on this information, one could argue that the abstract is comprehensive in providing a general understanding of the paper's scope and objectives.</p> <p>4. already appropriate</p> <p>5. the paper presents a quantitative analysis and comparative review of dividend policy dynamics within the banking sector, using global and U.S. financial data and existing literature. The paper also describes the methodology used to analyze the data, including the statistical tests and models employed. Based on this information, one could argue that the manuscript is scientifically correct in terms of its methodology and analysis. However, it is important to note that scientific correctness is subject to peer review and validation by the scientific community.</p> <p>6. The references cover a broad range of topics related to dividend policies and payments within the banking sector, including pre- and post-2008 financial crisis periods and both global and emerging market perspectives. Based on this information, one could argue that the references are sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant literature. However, it is always possible that additional references could be included, depending on the specific research question and scope of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. the language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communications. The paper follows a standard structure for academic research papers and uses technical language and terminology appropriate for the field of finance. The writing is clear, concise, and well-organized, with a logical flow of ideas and arguments. However, it is important to note that language quality is subjective and can vary depending on the reader's background and expectations. Nonetheless, based on the information provided, one could argue that the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Petty Aprilia Sari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Ppi, Indonesia</b>