

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_105242
Title of the Manuscript:	Business Plan and Implementation Report on Star-Egg: Omega-3-Enriched Egg in Sleman Yogyakarta
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>This manuscript is useful and comply for scientific community</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The structure of this manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>Yes. This manuscript is follow the 'conceptual paper' concept.</p> <p>The references are moderate. The author can add more references to strengthen the arguments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The languages are suitable for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The introduction of this manuscript is too long. Please make it more precise and short. However, the concept is there. (issue, research problem and the purpose of paper was stated and explained by the author)</p> <p>Just make the introduction of this manuscript more short and all the tables (table 1, table 2 and table 3) in introduction, put in one section in the literature review.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Usry Abdullah
Department, University & Country	Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia