

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_82372
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE ON PREDICTION FINANCIAL DISTRESS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajebo.com/index.php/AJEBA/editorial-policy>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why was the Modified Altman model just mentioned used? There are several modifications to this model and the reasons for using this need to be stated. 2. Some information from the "Hypothesis Development" section is repeated from previous sections of the article. 3. In the "Material and Methods" section, you state that you will use statistical methods based on secondary data from the financial statements. However, it is necessary to specify the specific methods that will be used and how they will be used. This general designation is not appropriate. It would be good to state how the individual methods will be applied and for what purpose. I also lack information about the software used here. Your research is now difficult to verify without this vital information. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors already write "" this report this August stated that Indonesia's... ". It states "this August", but it would be good to state the year as well, because this is already outdated and it is not "this August". 2. Figure 1 is only taken from another source, it would be good to create your own. 3. Are there any limits to your research? They should be included in the conclusion, if any. 4. The format of references is not entirely correct, especially the format of citations of electronic sources. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Jakub Horak
Department, University & Country	Institute of Technology and Business in Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic