**Reviewer Comments:**

Important papers are cited and related to this article sufficiently. Based on prior research there seem more evidence supporting one hypothesis (negative relation & asymmetric information) than the other (positive relation & momentum). More papers cited on the latter would help strengthen the matter of ongoing debate.

This empirical study is based on solid theoretical grounds as well as supporting empirical evidence in developed markets. To strengthen the findings, more control variables may be included. Firm ages may be used as one of control variables as prior research on studying IPO returns. Ln(Offering size) and Ln(Asset size) may both be included, but this research's ln(Market Cap), ln(B/M) should already captured these two variables. Market sentiment would also play key roles in determining volatility and IPO returns. News coverage or media attention would affect retail investors' demand on IPOs and could result in high/low volatility as well as first-day returns. In any cases, more control variables would make the case more convincing.

More discussion could be added in result sections, particularly in comparing to other findings in other developing markets or more on comparing to prior research in developed countries.

**Additional Questions:**

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes. This paper finds the negative relationship between the institutional holdings and the volatility of first-day IPO returns in Thailand. Also, the holding of institutions are correlated with under-pricing of IPOs. This would help guide policy makers in emerging countries.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Important papers are cited and related to this article sufficiently. Based on prior research there seem more evidence supporting one hypothesis (negative relation & asymmetric information) than the other (positive relation & momentum). More papers on the latter would help strengthen the matter of ongoing debate.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: This empirical study is based on solid theoretical grounds as well as supporting empirical evidence in developed markets. To strengthen the findings, more control variables may be included. Firm ages may be used as one of control variables as prior research on studying IPO returns. Ln(Offering size) and Ln(Asset size) may both be included, but this research's ln(Market Cap), ln(B/M) should already captured these two variables. Market sentiment would also play key roles in determining volatility and IPO returns. News coverage or media attention would affect retail investors' demand on IPOs and could result in high/low volatility as well as first-day returns.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Good, more discussion could be added in result sections, particularly in comparing to other findings in other developing markets or more on comparing to prior research in developed countries.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Implications for research, practice and/or society are clearly stated. It would be useful for policy makers, particularly in stabilizing IPO markets. However, more control variables would make the case more convincing.

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: This paper was written very well to academic journal standards and assumed appropriate knowledge of readers. Good writing.

Revision response (please help correct for proper English):

* I have revised the "ongoing debate" paragraph and added more references to support the positive relation & momentum hypothesis in order to redress the balance between evidence for both hypotheses and therefore enhance the ongoing debate. The added texts can be found in green on page 3.
* To strengthen the findings, I have added four more control variables, as advised: Ln(Offering size) and Ln(Asset size), firm age and investor attention. Several paragraphs have been added to Section 3 to accommodate the discussions about these additional control variables.

 Overview of the discussions regarding the added control variables:

- Firm age has a low correlation with the existing variables. It is now included in the main analysis as an additional control variable to help support the research. (Tables 2-6 were revised accordingly to accommodate the new control variable).

- In addition, I have provided further discussion about the methods used to offset the effect of market-level sentiment in the methodology section for greater clarity. The added text can be found in section 3: Data and methodology.

- As the reviewers rightly point out, Ln(Asset size) and Ln(Offering size) show correlation with market capitalization and B/M used in the study. It would be preferable to include investor attention but the dataset is found to be limited in emerging countries, which raises concerns about potential biases.

Nevertheless, additional discussions regarding these variables are provided in Section 3.

* I have provided more discussion in Section 4: Results and analysis to provide contexts for comparison with prior research in developed countries and to consider research implications.
* More references have been added to help support the added/revised texts.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to all the anonymous reviewers/editors whose valuable comments have helped to improve the quality of the article.