

[Review Form1.7](#)

JournalName:	AsianJournalof Economics,BusinessandAccounting
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJEBA_113482
TitleoftheManuscript:	EFFECTOFBUDGETPARTICIPATIONONTHEEFFECTIVENESSOFVERTICALINFORMATIONSHARING,PSYCHOLOGICALCAPITAL ANDMANAGEMENTCOMMITMENTANDITSIMPACTONMANAGEMENTPERFORMANCE
TypeoftheArticle	OriginalResearch 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write a 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>1. The effective and benefit of budget participation are obvious by this research article. "This research aims to prove empirically what determines the performance of managers of manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI)." "Budget Participation has a positive and significant effect on the management performance of manufacturing companies listed on the IDX. This means that the higher the level of participation in budget preparation, the better managerial performance will be."</p> <p>2. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. Yes, the article's abstract is thorough, offering a concise yet comprehensive overview of the research. It efficiently encapsulates the essence of the article, allowing readers to grasp its core without needing to dive into the complete text. In sum, the abstract functions as a meticulously organized and enlightening synopsis of the entire article.</p> <p>4. Yes, the manuscript's subsections and structural arrangement are fitting. Each section fulfills its role in bolstering the manuscript's coherence as a whole. The headings and subheadings skillfully steer the reader through the material, facilitating comprehension of the research aims, findings, and conclusions. Altogether, the manuscript's organization enhances the clarity and efficacy of its presentation.</p> <p>5. After a meticulous review of the manuscript, I am confident in its scientific integrity. The theoretical framework and analysis demonstrate a high level of proficiency, closely aligning with the research objectives. The authors have adeptly referenced pertinent literature and established a sturdy theoretical foundation. The results appear congruent with the research inquiry, and the conclusions drawn are firmly grounded in the presented data. However, it's noted that, in table 4. (Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results), hypothesis should be numbered in line with number in 2.2 Hypothesis. In summary, while the manuscript is generally scientifically correct, some revisions or clarifications may be necessary to strengthen specific aspects of the research.</p> <p>6. It is sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is suitable.</p>	

Review Form1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Yu Yu Myint
Department, University & Country	Yangon Youth Management Institute, Myanmar