Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEBA_107617**
Title of the Manuscript:	**House-Based Sustainable Development for House Great Disabilities in Cities Pasuruan : Study Indicators of Sustainable Development Goals in Indonesia according to The Financial Services Authority (OJK)**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

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)*
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. Importance to the Scientific Community: The manuscript discusses the concept of sustainable development in the context of a house-based program for people with disabilities in Pasuruan City, Indonesia. While it addresses a specific local initiative, it also touches upon broader sustainability principles. It would be beneficial to explicitly state the significance of the study's findings and how they can inform broader sustainable development practices. 2. Suitability of the Title: The title of the article, "House-Based Sustainable Development for House Great Disabilities in Cities Pasuruan : Study Indicators of Sustainable Development Goals in Indonesia according to The Financial Services Authority (OJK)," is somewhat confusing, lengthy and does not effectively convey the paper's content. A more concise and descriptive title, such as "Assessing Sustainable Development Goals Implementation in Pasuruan's Great Disability House," would be more suitable and informative. 3. Comprehensive Abstract: The abstract provides a general overview of the study's objectives and methods but lacks specific details about the findings. It should be expanded to include a concise summary of the key findings or outcomes of the study. A brief summary of the main results and their implications would enhance the abstract's value. 4. Subsections and Manuscript Structure: The manuscript's subsections and structure appear appropriate, following the conventional format of introduction, methods, results, and conclusion. However, there are issues with grammar, punctuation, improved organization, and formatting throughout the text, which need improvement. 5. Scientific Correctness: The manuscript discusses the concept of sustainable development and its application to the Great Disability House in Pasuruan City. While it presents a qualitative and quantitative analysis, it lacks specific data and statistical information to support its claims. To enhance its scientific correctness, the paper should provide more empirical evidence and quantitative data to support its arguments. Additionally, the paper should avoid making broad statements without proper evidence or citations. 6. References: The references cited in the manuscript appear relevant to the topic. However, the formatting of citations and references is inconsistent and needs to be standardized according to a specific citation style (e.g., APA, MLA). Additionally, more recent references should be incorporated to strengthen the paper's current relevance. Additionally, some references seem unrelated to the topic, and their relevance should be clarified or reconsidered. Overall, the manuscript addresses an important topic related to sustainable development and disability inclusion in Pasuruan City. However, it requires revisions to clarify its significance, improve the title, provide more detailed results, correct grammar and punctuation issues, and ensure consistency in referencing. Additionally, updating the references with more recent sources would enhance the paper's credibility and relevance.	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that could be improved: 1. Clarity and Precision: The manuscript contains awkward sentence structures that can impede comprehension. For example, there are frequent instances of incomplete sentences, inconsistent verb tenses, and unclear phrasing. 2. Consistency: The use of terminology and concepts could be more consistent throughout the article. Some terms and concepts are repeated without clear differentiation, which can create confusion. 3. Sentence Structure: Some sentences are quite long and complex, which may hinder comprehension. Simplifying sentence structures and breaking down complex ideas into smaller sentences can improve readability. 4. Use of Technical Jargon: The paper occasionally uses technical jargon and abbreviations without clear explanations. It's important to ensure that all technical terms are defined or explained for readers who may not be experts in the field. 5. Academic Style: The paper could benefit from adhering to a more formal academic writing style. For example, in academic writing, it's customary to use the full names of organizations and avoid contractions (e.g., "cannot" instead of "can't"). 6. Citations: It's important to provide proper citations for references, including the publication dates of the sources you mention. In some instances, sources are mentioned without specific details. 7. Proofreading: While the manuscript is generally well-written, minor typos and punctuation errors could be addressed with thorough proofreading. Overall, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. Still, a careful review for clarity, consistency, and technical precision would enhance the manuscript's readability and overall quality.	
Optional/General comments	To enhance the suitability of the article for scholarly communication, thorough proofreading and editing are required. Based on the review provided and the identified areas for improvement, I would assign the following overall marks to this manuscript: The manuscript has potential, but it requires substantial revisions to improve its scientific rigor, clarity, and structure. Addressing the suggested improvements and incorporating empirical data or case studies would significantly enhance its quality and scientific validity.	

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:	**Floyd Thompson**
Department, University & Country	**Jamaica**