

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_110023
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Analysis and Comparative Review of Dividend Policy Dynamics within the Banking Sector: Insights from Global and U.S. Financial Data and Existing Literature
Type of the Article	Based on the information provided, the article appears to be a "Review 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript is highly important for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive and comparative review of dividend policies within the banking sector. The focus on global and U.S. financial data, encompassing pre- and post-2008 financial crisis periods, adds depth to the analysis. The findings on the multifaceted nature of bank dividend strategies and their implications for capital levels, profitability, and regulatory compliance make a significant contribution to the existing body of knowledge.</p> <p>Suitability of the Title: The title is appropriate as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. It effectively conveys that the paper offers a quantitative analysis and comparative review of dividend policy dynamics within the banking sector, drawing insights from global and U.S. financial data and existing literature. No alternative title suggestions are necessary.</p> <p>Comprehensiveness of the Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive. It succinctly summarizes the key aspects of the paper, including the research focus, methodologies employed, major findings, and the significance of the study. It serves as an effective standalone summary that gives readers a clear understanding of the paper's contributions.</p> <p>Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure: The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The paper follows a logical flow, starting with an introduction, followed by a literature review, methodology, key findings, and a conclusion. Each section is well-defined, contributing to the overall clarity and readability of the paper.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness: The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The methodologies mentioned, such as regression analyses, causality tests, and financial ratio computations, are commonly accepted in financial research. The inclusion of both global and emerging market perspectives adds robustness to the analysis. However, it would be beneficial to provide more details on the specific models and variables used in the regression analyses to enhance transparency and reproducibility.</p> <p>Adequacy and Recency of References: The references are generally adequate, and the inclusion of pre- and post-2008 financial crisis literature adds a historical context. However, it would be beneficial to ensure that the most recent studies (post-2022) are included to capture the latest developments in the field. Additionally, if possible, including references from diverse geographical regions could further enhance the global perspective of the study.</p> <p>Additional Suggestions/Comments: Consider providing more details on the crisis-induced behaviors and short-term deviations mentioned in the abstract. Elaborating on these aspects in the main body of the paper would provide a deeper understanding of the complexities associated with bank dividend strategies during crises. Ensure that the paper discusses potential limitations of the methodologies employed and suggests avenues for future research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article appear to be suitable for scholarly communication. The text is generally clear, well-structured, and employs formal academic language. However, here are some minor suggestions for improvement:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Consistency in Citations: Ensure consistency in citing authors and their works. For instance, in the introduction, "Base et al., 2022" is cited, but the full name of the author and the publication might be helpful for the reader. Consistency in citation format enhances the professionalism of the article.</p> <p>Clarification and Redundancy: Consider clarifying the phrase "intense economic and financial activities" in the introduction to provide more specific information about what activities are being referred to. In the Literature Review section, some sentences could be more concise. For example, in the paragraph beginning with "Important insights can be gained," consider breaking it down into more digestible segments for better clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a comprehensive review of dividend policies within the banking sector, addressing a critical aspect of financial studies. The author effectively synthesizes existing literature, incorporating insights from global and U.S. financial data, and spans pre- and post-2008 financial crisis periods. The inclusion of studies from emerging markets adds valuable diversity to the analysis.</p> <p>The literature review is particularly strong, covering various dimensions of dividend policies, their implications on financial performance, market reactions, and the intricate relationship with corporate governance structures. The inclusion of specific studies and their findings enhances the credibility of the review. Additionally, the incorporation of diverse perspectives, such as those from Vietnamese enterprises, adds richness to the discussion.</p> <p>The manuscript successfully navigates through different sections, maintaining a logical flow. Each subsection is well-organized, contributing to the overall coherence of the paper. The use of subsections like "Dividend Policy and Financial Performance" and "Market Reactions to Dividend Policies" aids in the reader's understanding of the complex relationships explored.</p> <p>However, to further strengthen the manuscript:</p> <p>Consider providing more details on the crisis-induced behaviors mentioned in the abstract. Elaborating on these behaviors in the main body of the paper would provide deeper insights into how crises impact bank dividend strategies.</p> <p>Ensure that the methodology section includes sufficient details about the specific models and variables used in regression analyses for transparency and reproducibility.</p> <p>Dedication to the work done</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sani Abdullahi Sule</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia</p>