

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEBA_107641</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Analysis of Financial Report Effectiveness Through Berlo Communication Model: A Case Study of PT Megah Sembada Industry, Indonesia</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, it is poor written and ideas not well connected for the reader's effective comprehension.</p> <p><b>OK.</b> Remove abbreviation: PT</p> <p><b>OK.</b> Needs editing as indicated in the reviewed document.</p> <p><b>Yes.</b> If possible add 'recommendations'.</p> <p>It is but need to be well written and ideas/points scientifically communicated.</p> <p>Somehow ok!</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Tables</b></p>	<p><b>Manuscript editing is strongly recommended.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a study report use past tense.</li> <li>2. Follow journal-accepted use of Tables and Figures.</li> <li>3. Materials and methods section is not clearly presented making the reviewer wonder if the author(s) is/are conversant with the methodology presented.</li> <li>4. Use standard age groups: 44-25; 26-34; 35-44; 55+ and arrange groups chronologically.</li> <li>5. Briefly present Berlo's SMCR: origin, advantages and disadvantage, why chosen over others.</li> <li>6. Presentation in Table 1 is not clear/understandable!! That is, how is it connected to the study (see 5)???</li> <li>7. Incomprehensible sentences/phrase are indicated throughout the reviewed document.</li> <li>8. How many recruitees participated in the two approaches: qualitative vs. quantitative!</li> <li>9. Qualitative data poorly analysed and presented.</li> <li>10. Could the author(s) present some questions asked for data in Table 2-6.</li> <li>11. Discuss only results presented NOT new ones!</li> <li>12. I wonder if the author(s) really conducted a study or they did an armchair thinking! That is, used own experience to make up results presented.</li> <li>13. There is poor connection/link between the claimed communication Model and the rest of the presentation.</li> <li>14. Use one style of journal-accepted reference listing.</li> </ol> <p><b>Manuscript editing is strongly recommended!</b></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Switbert Rwechungura Kamazima</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania</b>