Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_130337
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Efficiency, Financing Risk, Liquidity, Independent Commissioner Composition, and Sharia Supervisory Board toward Financial Performance in Sharia Banks
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

<mark>PART 1:</mark> 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This study has a scientific contribution because it provides empirical evidence regarding the factors that affect financial performance in Islamic banks. By analyzing the influence of efficiency, financing risk, liquidity, independent commissioner composition, and Islamic supervisory board, this study adds to the understanding of how these elements interact in the context of Islamic banking which is different from conventional banking. The findings in this paper can serve as a basis for further research and provide practical recommendations for the management of Islamic banks in improving their stability and profitability. In addition, this study enriches the literature on corporate governance in the Islamic financial sector, which is still relatively limited.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes** **However, it is fairly long and could be made more concise to improve readability while still capturing the essential elements. For instance, an alternative phrasing might be:** **"Determinants of Financial Performance in Sharia Banks"**	
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.	**Overall, the abstract provides a concise overview of the study's aim (examining the impact of BOPO, NPF, FDR, ICC, and Sharia Supervisory Board on financial performance of Islamic banks), the methodology (panel data regression with Random Effect Model), key findings (NPF and FDR negatively affect ROA, BOPO, ICC, and GCG show no significant effect), and practical implications (useful reference for decision-making by banks and investors).**	

Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, however, there are suggestions for potential technical improvements:	
	• Introduction section is poorly written and also doesn't include sufficient discussion on motivation and contribution of this study. Penurunan ROA hanya di tahun 2023 belumbisamenjadidasaralasanmengapapenelitianiniperludilakukan. I suggest author to re-write this section in following order: (ii) Why is it important? (iii) What is new about your work?; (iv) Your approach; (v) Findings & contributions.	
	• The explanation of how Stewardship theory supports each hypothesis needs to be clarified. Transitions between sections and paragraphs are not correct. For example, the move from stewardship theory to the effect of BOPO on financial performance feels abrupt without a clear link.	
	• It is not explained how many Islamic banking samples are in this study.	
	• The study suggests heteroscedasticity, but does not address this issue. They could clarify whether they employed robust standard errors or another corrective measure to ensure valid inference.	
	• There are repeated words in subsection 3.1.4 Heteroscedasticity and Serial Correlation Results "However, the random effects model."	
	• There are no robustness tests undertaken.	
	• Is it possible for NPF and FDR to be 0, which means that the bank does not distribute financing to customers.	
	• Explanations in the analysis section are highly mechanistic rather than intuitive explanations. The author has not provided any original analysis based on the obtained results; instead, they have merely reiterated the analyses of previous researchers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, updating some of the more recent sources (especially from the last 2-3 years) will further enrich the literature base of this text: [65] C. F. Baum, "Residual Diagnostics For Cross-Section Time Series Regression Models," Stata J.	
	Promot. Commun. Stat. Stata, Vol. 1, No. 1, Pp. 101–104, 2001, Doi: 10.1177/1536867x0100100108. [66] D. M. Drukker, "Testing For Serial Correlation In Linear Panel-Data Models," Stata J. Promot. Commun. Stat. Stata, Vol. 3, No. 2, Pp. 168–177, 2003, Doi: 10.1177/1536867x0300300206.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, In general, the language used in the manuscript is adequate and intelligible for scholarly communication. Some sentences appear slightly fragmented or redundant. For instance, the use of articles (a, an, the) and singular-plural agreement in a few places could be polished for smoother reading.	
Optional/General comments	This paper has good potential for publication. Summary:	
	• Strengths: relevant topic, topic of corporate governance in the Islamic finance sector is still limited, structured testing, panel data analysis.	
	• Cons: methodology needs deepening (handling heteroscedasticity, outliers), no robustness testing, theoretical discussion and practical implications can still be sharpened, and recent references need to be added.	

	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:	**Desmy Riani**
Department, University & Country	**Ibn Khaldun University, Indonesia**