

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_129431
Title of the Manuscript:	E-Monev Policy Implementation In The Regional Secretariat of North Gorontalo Regency
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is valuable for highlighting the challenges and progress in implementing the e-Monev system in regional governance. It bridges theoretical approaches with real-world applications in monitoring and evaluation systems. I appreciate the study for its comprehensive analysis of organizational, interpretive, and implementation dimensions, though it could be enhanced with deeper statistical evaluations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative but could be refined for clarity and global comprehension. Suggested title: <i>Challenges and Progress in e-Monev Policy Implementation: A Case Study of North Gorontalo Regency.</i>	
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.	The abstract effectively summarizes the study but could be enhanced by specifying the implications of the findings and mentioning the methodological approach more succinctly. It should also address the broader significance of the findings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, employing qualitative methods effectively to address its research questions. The triangulation of data through interviews, observations, and documentation enhances its credibility. However, its robustness would benefit from a detailed evaluation of the data's quantitative aspects to substantiate findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and sufficient but could include more recent publications to reflect the latest developments in e-Monev systems and monitoring technologies.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical adjustments and rephrasing of sentences for brevity and clarity could further improve the readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, with clear sections on methods, results, and discussions. However, adding subsections to highlight distinct findings in the results and discussion could improve readability.	

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farhang Salehi
Department, University & Country	Iran