

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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript presented information that are important for scientific community</p> <p>2. The Title of the article is suitable but the author(s) should avoid abbreviation hoping that readers understand what the acronyms denote</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>5. No scientific evidence was presented</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7. Abbreviated words should be mention in full at first citing</p> <p>8. The significance should be added to understand the purpose of the study</p> <p>9. Author(s) should add suggestion to the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language used for the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bisiryu Abiodun Taleat
Department, University & Country	Federal University, Nigeria