

Paper: “Cost stickiness in the Italian Mutual Banks and comparison among Less Significant Banks”

Submitted: 05 August 2024

Accepted: 06 September 2024

Published: 30 September 2024

Corresponding Author: Domenico Piatti

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n25p15](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n25p15)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: J. J. Okonkwo
Nnamdi Azikiwe University (UNIZIK), Nigeria

Reviewer 2: Foldi Kata
University of Debrecen, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Mauro Berumen
Universidad del Caribe, Mexico

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear enough and matches the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is concise though needs to reflect the method

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The language of the work is good

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The method is explained clearly but needs to be showcased in the abstract

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is good for any reader to understand

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is adequate enough and is supported by the content of the research

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The work needs to be updated with more recent citations so as to gain currency as there are few old citations in the work

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Add more recent citations to gain currency as there are few old citations in the work

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is too short, only four sentences. The authors should write some more sentences about objects, methods and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There isn't grammatical error and spelling mistake in this article. But dummy variable expression the dummy word should be explained. On the 8th page the "winsorized" expression should be replaced it with a synonym

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. I only missed the relative standard deviation behind the mean, and deviation columns.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Less Significant Banks (including Mutual banks) expressions in the full manuscript used with LP and MB abbreviations. These expressions should be explained in more detail.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

A term needs to be corrected within the article. It is possible that this correction will cause it to be changed in the title as well. It is necessary to make the term consistent throughout the writing

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract should include the purpose of the research and the summarized methodology. If you still have space, please indicate the originality of your research.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

- Avoid writing in the third person (e.g., we). (In the abstract, it is used three times)
- In the abstract, it is just 'period', not 'time period.'
- The second line of the introduction presents the term 'cost asymmetry', but the third line of the literature review presents the term 'sticky costs'. It should be clear which term will be used; it changes throughout the article. I recommend the second.
- In the Introduction section, the second paragraph initiates with 'over the past decade', but the references used have more than 20 years, so it should be 'Over the past two decades'
- In the third paragraph of the introduction, it is stated that there are several reasons, but there are only four reasons; it should be indicated as such.
- In the third paragraph of the introduction, they use the words 'in light of'; because of the type of document they present, I recommend using 'considering'.
- Footnotes are not used in scientific papers.
- In the literature review section, they use the term 'Phenomenon of sticky costs', but it is not a phenomenon, it is a behavior, so use the term 'behavior' instead.
- In the last paragraph of the literature review, in the first line, it is written 'none at

all,' use 'none.'

- Table 2 uses the term Outstanding Loans, but in the text, are using Non-profit Loans
- is it the same? To unify it.
- In the last lines of the methodology, there is a term 'winsorized'; is this correct?
- Acronyms should be clearly indicated in the table headings. Some are capitalized, and others are lowercase. MBs vs Mbs.
- Table 3, it is P25, not P25, comes from Pk.
- Table 6, Betas must be subscripted
- In the Table 6 is Dvhighnpl, but in the note is DVhighnpl.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

- In the introduction, it's crucial to add the context of the research, but equally important is to underscore the significance of the sector being studied. This will help to pique the interest of the reader and make them more engaged in the research. Indicate why the results of your study are important for this sector, as this will further underline the relevance of your work.
- The purpose of the research is presented in the last or penultimate paragraph of the introduction section. One purpose appears in the second paragraph and another in the fifth paragraph, and both aims do not coincide.
- Explain how the percentages in Table 2 were obtained.
- In Table 3. Dollars or Euros?

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

- Describe your observations in one paragraph. Include the dispersion of the data (I recommend the coefficient of variation).
- In Table 5, at the bottom of the table, add how the adjusted R2 varies.
- In subtopic 4.2, when describing the result of H2, what was compared to assert the difference, do it the same way as did with H1.
- The H4 indicates that it is partially confirmed, but it should be indicated whether it is rejected or not rejected; how do you justify the partially?
- What statistical information justifies the following statement: In less efficient MBs, there is cost stickiness in total costs not influenced by credit risk. However, in other LS banks, cost behavior asymmetry seems to be conditioned solely by credit risk. In essence, less efficient MBs exhibit natural cost stickiness regardless of the level of abnormal credits.
- I found no information to justify the following assertion: In other words, greater efficiency allows for a more flexible cost structure, capable of neutralizing asymmetric cost behavior, but only for the portion not generated by credit risk. On the other hand, less efficient banks present a contradictory situation.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

- It is necessary to compare the research results with the studies cited in the literature review, at least the most important ones. At this point, the contribution and the gap closed by this research in knowledge become evident.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

- In the literature review section are quoted (Cooper and Kaplan, 1999), but they are not in references.
- In the literature review section, the quote (e.g. Subramaniam and Watson), eliminate the 'e.g.'
- The following academic products in references are not cited in the document: Alessandrini, Masera.
- When quoting Cooper, R., Kaplan, R. S. (1991). The design of cost management

systems: Text, cases, and readings. Prentice Hall. The quote appears as (Cooper and Kaplan, 1998), a different year.

- Cite at least three articles published in the Journal you wish to publish, in this case European Scientific Journal.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear authors, your research is very detailed and statistically sound. I am writing to you to improve your article. I look forward to reviewing the corrections soon.
