

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_123161
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effect of Tax Awareness, Tax Understanding, and Tax Morals on Taxpayer Compliance from the Gender Perspective of MSME Entrepreneurs in the Tanah Abang Market
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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.	Taxation is the Global farne work for nations of the world. It is the mode of govt Revenue for Governance, care and development of the people for better life. And so the manuscript has great significance and importance for the scientific community. Otherwise, since I have been part of the Taxation authority, have a like for this manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Very suitable	
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.	Abstract of the article is comprehensive enough.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The scientific correctness of this manuscript is of optimally acceptable level. The three hypothesis with validated design and data analysis results has prove the manuscript as scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A scholarly good Manuscript.	

Review Form 3

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:	Chandramani P Singh
Department, University & Country	India