

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_99051
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINING FACTORS OF POVERTY IN EAST JAVA PROVINCE, 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>)

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)	1. Yes, it is very important due to most of the communities in the globe are faced by this problems (poverty problem). 2. Yes, 3. The abstract has so many barriers. You can refer the comments on main document. 4. The structure of the manuscript is not fully addressed. 1) In the introductory part: you didn't show objectives, research questions or hypothesis, importance of the research part. 2) In the methodology part: almost all structures are missed like description of the study are, sampling techniques, types of research approaches, data sources, data analysis. Simply put materials and methods; there is no main titles and subtitles. 3) In the results part: three is no main title and subtitle simply put results and discussion. It is smooth like news. You have to rewrite again this part. 5. Yes but it needs modification in the structures 6. It is good but some of the references are very old. If it is possible update	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nahusenay Abate Dessie
Department, University & Country	Samara University, Ethiopia