

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_95501
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Investor Trust in Mediating Corporate Social Responsibility, Environmental Performance and Financial Performance on Firm Value in Manufacturing Companies Listed on The Indonesia Stock Exchange
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	yes yes It is better to specify the direction of the relationship between research variables (positive or negative) in the abstract section yes yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The references should be arranged alphabetically and then the in-text numbering should also be changed. - Use more up-to-date references - The conclusion section is very brief and has not been interpreted. Also, a comparison with the results of past research and the expression of the research literature has not been done for proper interpretation. - A separate table should be inserted and the method of measuring each of the research variables should be described in it (by mentioning the reference). - In the table Hypothesis Test it should be Mentioned the Name the variables. - The regression models of the research should be presented and references should be mentioned for all the models used. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are writing points in the text of the article that need to be corrected (in minor cases, they have not been observed).	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahdi Filsaraei
Department, University & Country	Hakim Toos Higher Education Institute, Iran