

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Economics, Management and Trade</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEMT_116550</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Influence of Stakeholder Participation On Eudaimonic Well-Being, Which Is Mediated By Service Experience And Moderated By Social Support And Stakeholder Empowerment At Bappeda, Mimika District</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes it is. The terms used are understandable and straight forward. However, the paper is a bit too long (The reviewer is not sure how long the paper should be because other publishers would limit the length to 14 pages max). But I am impressed with how the author expressed themselves.</p> <p>The title is suitable but also too long. The recommended number of words for the title is usually 14. More than that its too long.</p> <p>It is, however, I feel the research approach should have been stated on the abstract.</p> <p>They are and there is consistency on paragraphs.</p> <p>It is.</p> <p>I am impressed with the reference, they are detailed. It shows that the author consulted many authors.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English is perfect. It is easy to follow the researcher when explaining things.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Citations: The author is not consistent. E.g., when they end the sentence the citation must have "&amp;" instead of "and". When the citation is at the beginning of the sentence then the author can use "and". There are places where the author has 3 authors and they will use a comma before specifying the last author, they need not use that.</p> <p>Instead of using "So" the author must rather use "Therefore" or just state the hypotheses.</p> <p>The font on the table should also be Arial and not Roman Times. Why are the fonts in table 4 bigger than the font on others? Please be consistent with a font size.</p> <p>On the tables sometimes the author would start the description with a capital letter, sometimes small letter just be consistent.</p> <p>Please check your numbering on the conclusion.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tefo Gordon Sekgweleo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Eskom South Africa, South Africa</b>