

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Economics, Management and Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEMT_86729
Title of the Manuscript:	DEFENSE INDUSTRY STRATEGY IN STRENGTHENING THE INDONESIAN ECONOMY
Type of the 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.journaljemt.com/index.php/JEMT/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The objectives of the study have not been truly analysed as reported in the abstract. 2. There are a lot of grammatical errors. The article should be sent for proofreading. 3. The specific objectives of the study should be well defined. 4. The author should avoid too many repetitions e.g. “Dr. Hery Mochtady as Vice President of Corporate Performance Planning PT. Pindad (Persero) in the KKDN activities of the Faculty of FMP UNHAN RI said that PT Pindad (Persero) has prepared strategic steps for the growth of the Defense and security product business, namely.....” This can be found in pages 6 & 7. 5. More references are needed in the body of the work and all ‘intellectual properties’ used in the article should be well cited. 6. The author did not test for hypotheses. 7. The author should include in the methodology, the analytical tools and instrument used for testing the hypotheses. 8. The author should add presentation and analysis of data to justify that data were collected and analyzed. 9. The study does not have discussion of findings, conclusion and recommendations. The author should also check for consistency with earlier literatures. The conclusion section should focus more on findings and their implications. 10. Over 80 percent of the reference lists cannot be traceable to the body of the work (e.g: BPS Negara Indonesia. (2020); Dipua, A., Harahap, N., Puspitawati, D., Aminuddin, et. Al (2021); Kasih Prihantoro Zakariya, Lukman et. Al (2019); Kurniawan, A. (2021), etc. These should be deleted from the reference lists. 11 The reference list did not adopt any specific reference style. Most of the references were presented haphazardly. The author should adopt the APA style. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author used too many theories in the study. A single or two theories should have been used. This theoretical framework should be well presented in two or three paragraphs while showing the relationships between all the variables used for the study. 2. 	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beredugo, Sunny Biobele
Department, University & Country	Arthur Jarvis University, Nigeria