



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_49129
Title of the Manuscript:	FACTORS AFFECTING THE EARNING RESPONSE COEFFICIENT WITH REAL ACTIVITIES EARNING MANAGEMENT AS MODERATOR: EVIDENCE FROM INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGE
Type of the Article	Case study

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction does not provide sufficient background and include all relevant references</li> <li>2. The research design is appropriate but can be improved ( Justification supported by relevant references stating why you adopted this research design and all the steps adopted in the methodology )</li> <li>3. The results are not clearly presented, it can be improved</li> <li>4. The conclusions clearly supports the results, however much comparison should be done with the views of other researchers. That is the only way the relevance and contribution of the findings can be pointed out</li> <li>5. Point out the limitations and recommendations for further studies for other researchers to consider ( it adds relevance to your work )</li> <li>6. Extensive editing of English language and style is required</li> <li>7. Additionally , state clearly the connection/linkage between results and the research gaps found in the literature review (Literature discusses exiting problems , so the results and findings should address them)</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All the hypothesis tested could be confirmed by previous studies ( if adopted from other scholars )</li> <li>2. Whatever result you get whether positive or negative (accept /rejected hypothesis ) should come with a reason and compare with others</li> <li>3. What are the theoretical and practical implications of the findings? Please integrate every part of the paper to build a good case for your entire study.</li> <li>4. The literature review doesn't demonstrate your full understanding of the concept - improve the literature</li> <li>5. Check the formatting of the headings (maintain a uniform font style )</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Thank you for letting me read this paper which deals with a very relevant topic. Focus on integrating your results, and justify every result, method and approach.	

**PART 2:**

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

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Peter Yao Lartey .</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Jiangsu University, China</i></b>