

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_125381
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Select Variables on Tangible Book Value Multiple of U.S. Regional Banks
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript offers valuable insights into the factors influencing the Price-to-Tangible Book Value (P/TBV) multiples of U.S. regional banks over two decades. Understanding these relationships is crucial for investors and policymakers in making informed decisions regarding bank valuations, especially in a post-crisis landscape. I appreciate how the study employs rigorous econometric techniques to analyze significant variables affecting valuations, making it a relevant contribution to the financial sector.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, looks good.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from more emphasis on the study's implications for investors. Adding a sentence about the practical applications of the findings could enhance its impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The organization allows for a clear flow of information, making it easy to follow the arguments and findings.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The application of longitudinal panel data analysis across a substantial sample of banks ensures the findings are reliable. The authors effectively control for various time-specific factors and utilize appropriate econometric models, reinforcing the credibility of the results. Additionally, the discussion thoroughly contextualizes the findings within existing literature, enhancing its scientific rigor	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and generally recent. However, I recommend including more recent studies from 2021 onwards to ensure a comprehensive literature review	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication, though some sentences could be simplified for better readability.	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. The manuscript would benefit from proofreading to correct minor grammatical errors and improve clarity.</div> <div>2. Consider expanding the conclusion to briefly outline the implications for future research more explicitly.</div>	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Manoj Kumar Vandanapu
Department, University & Country	USA