

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_97515
Title of the Manuscript:	PREDICTION OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IN INDONESIA
Type of the Article	Empirical

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The article is found to be interesting for a reader, but the implication of such work is unclear, that how and why this work holds a need for research.</p> <p>Yes, the work of paper is well identified from the title</p> <p>Yes, but the novelty of work is missing as similar work has already been done by implementing same econometrics models. Yes, the subsections are dully highlighted</p> <p>As far as the research methodology is concerned it well presented especially the purpose of selecting ARIMA</p> <p>Yes the references are significant enough to support the research work</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language seems to be quite ok, without using unnecessary explanation or jargons.	
Optional/General comments	Check the Keywords there needs to be few more keywords that will help to search the paper and able to understand the paper contents. Key word: Entrepreneurship has no significant use in the article so such can be avoided	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arya Kumar
Department, University & Country	Kalinga Institute of Industrial Technology, India