

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_119361
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPORT PERFORMANCE OF CPO AND RPO: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA
Type of the 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 provides a thorough comparison between Indonesia and Malaysia with regard to CPO and RPO export performances - two major producers and exporters of both commodities - in terms of export performance.</p> <p>2. The title accurately conveys the contents and focus of the manuscript; no changes are needed</p> <p>3. The abstract is quite comprehensive</p> <p>4. Subsections are generally well structured, but there are a few to include as suggestion :</p> <p>a. More recent studies could be included to reflect the latest research trends and findings relating to CPO and/or RPO</p> <p>b. The methodology may explain potential limitations or biases in the data collection and analysis process</p> <p>c. There is less mention of how the data were processed or the specific statistical techniques used in this paper</p> <p>d. The discussion could benefit from a more critical analysis of the results, including possible reasons for the observed trends and their implications for future policy</p> <p>e. Put forward the practical implications of this research for policy makers and industry stakeholders</p> <p>f. Potential limitations?</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically sound</p> <p>6. References provided are adequate and include both theory and empirical studies that support your thesis; however, more recent CPO or RPO studies could improve this paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, agree</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:	Fansuri Munawar
Department, University & Country	Universitas Widyatama, Indonesia