

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_125526
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A comparative analysis of Accounting Ethics Between Private and Public Organizations: A Case Study of Morogoro Municipality</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This is interesting to write in the manuscript. The author conducted a comparative analysis of accounting ethics between private and public organizations, which is still rare for several previous authors.  <b>SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title aptly reflects the contents of the manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the article's abstract is comprehensive, containing the study's objectives, methods, population, and results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the manuscript's structure is orderly. Readers will not find difficulties in reading it.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper needs to add its Significance value to Table 3: Objectivity in Decision Making to Show that the observed effects or differences did not occur by chance. Assure that the research findings are reliable and generalizable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references is sufficient for a manuscript of this length. However, some of the references cited were published more than ten years ago, so they still need to be paid more attention to or can be replaced with newer theories or references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is aptly formal for scholarly communications and very well written. In fact, I found no grammatical or writing mistakes in the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Andi Indrawati</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas 17 Agustus 1945, Indonesia</b>