

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_112601
Title of the Manuscript:	BPK LHP Existence, Regional Heads Commitment, and Regional House Parliaments supervisory Function Influence on Educational Performance
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes, the manuscript presented information that are important for scientific community 2. The Title of the article is suitable but the author(s) should avoid abbreviation hoping that readers understand what the acronyms denote 3. The abstract is comprehensive but the author(s) need to attend to little correction as suggested in the manuscript. The author should clearly the aims/objectives in sentences. The author(s) should try and let the abstract include; the Aims/objectives, methodology, findings, conclusion and suggestions. 4. The sub-sections need to be restructure. For instance, literature review instead of material and method. Hypotheses should have a subsection separately. I will suggest that the author(s) remove the hypotheses because it was not tested nor reported in the results of finding. Discussion of findings instead of result and discussion. 5. No scientific evidence was presented 6. Some cited authors were not referenced. (E.g. Cassel, (2014), Mardiasmo, (2018), Rajkumar & Swaroop (2008), Ramkumar (2009), Shea, 1999, Walden (2018) and many more. Author(s) should check for its appropriateness. Inconsistent in reference style should be addressed. 7. Abbreviated words should be mention in full at first citing 8. The significance should be added to understand the purpose of the study 9. Author(s) should add suggestion to the study.	Thank you for taking the time to review my journal. I have revised my journal according to your suggestions and directions. Please contact me immediately if there is anything I need to revise.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language used for the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	Nope, there is no ethical problem in this manuscript.