

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_101925
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF THE REPORT OF AUDIT AGENCY OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA ON THE FINANCIAL REPORTS OF THE REGIONAL GOVERNMENT OF PEGUNUNGAN BINTANG DISTRICT, PAPUA PROVINCE
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title of the article must be changed to attract readers 2. The article has explained the objectives, methodology, results and discussion but still uses Indonesian terms and with an unclear methodology 3. Subsection of the article is appropriate 4. The methodology of the article is not clear so the results and conclusions are not conclusive. I do not understand why the researcher could conclude that the opinion given depends on internal control weaknesses. And researchers must use a more relevant year of observation. 5. The article is not based on previous research 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The quality of English must be improved. In some parts still use Indonesian	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	NI Nyoman Ayu Suryandari
Department, University & Country	Universitas Mahasarawasti Denpasar, Indonesia