

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_101662
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Willingness To Pay Working Accident Protection for Online Motorcycle Drivers
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> <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>1. This research is important and urgent to be carried out in Indonesia because online service models are in great demand by the public, including application-based modes of transportation, so a protection program is needed not only for users of online transportation services but also actors who are partners of online application service managers.</p> <p>2. The selection of the title is in accordance with the contents and results of the research</p> <p>3. writing an abstract, comprehensive and well contained regarding the research objectives and research results.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subtitles and the sections are in accordance with the contents</p> <p>5. This article, the writing has followed scientific principles properly.</p> <p>6. The references used have used references from scientific writings for the last 10 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the language used follows scientific rules</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Additional narration is needed, that online transportation service actors with generally owned backgrounds have the ability to make insurance premium payments, so that the next challenge for BPJS is to socialize the perpetrators.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Rais Rahmat Razak
Department, University & Country	Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia