

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. Human capital formation is the key to economic development of a country. Education being a component of human development will necessarily help economic development. The policy relating to the effective educational performance is of utmost important. In this context the manuscript is relevant. 2. The title is complex in nature. It may not be clear to the reader since it contains acronyms and many segments of one factor. There is spelling mistakes. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. But it is too big. A good abstract always contains less than 250 words. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. 5. There is no clear theoretical or empirical explanation in the manuscript. 6. The references are sufficient and recent to some extent. However, inclusion of few more recent references and use of a single reference style may improve the quality of the manuscript. The references cited in the text are not found in the reference section.  7. The author has described many things in the manuscript. However, the introduction contains too many vague things. It does not clearly reveal the objective, research gap and findings. Theoretical framework section is not clear. The conclusion does not reveal the contribution and policy suggestion. It is descriptive in nature. There are too many acronyms in the manuscript which are not clear.	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.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	To some extent.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Nope, there is no ethical problem in this manuscript.