

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_103891
Title of the Manuscript:	ANALYSIS OF DETERMINANTS OF COOPERATIVE PROFIT IN INDONESIA
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, an important topic for society to acquire knowledge about the country's profits each year.</p> <p>The title appears adequate and cohesive</p> <p>Yes, it presents itself according to the context described</p> <p>Some subtopics need adjustments.</p> <p>The present article is necessary some corrections to adjust according to the norms.</p> <p>References are good and up to date</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is presented in a clear and easy-to-understand manner</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Suggestions for work</p> <p>1 – Firstly, it is suggested to remove the table in the introduction, where a running text occurs.</p> <p>2- Insert the general objective of the work</p> <p>3 – In the methodology, insert type of study, inclusion and exclusion criteria, how many articles were used for research, which languages were found, which databases were used for the use of articles?</p> <p>4- In the results and discussion better organize the topic, it is necessary to remove the subtopics and unite them in paragraphs as a complete and running text.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mônica Barbosa de Sousa Freitas
Department, University & Country	Florida Christian University, USA