



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_44981
Title of the Manuscript:	FORWARD-LOOKING INFORMATION BASED ON INTEGRATED REPORTING PERSPECTIVE: VALUE RELEVANCE STUDY IN INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGES
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:

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

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>(1) There is no recommendation in abstract, aside this abstract is commended.</p> <p>(2) The paper would have been of international standard if its empirical. 21<sup>st</sup> century academics often write an empirical paper.</p> <p>(3) Introduction: Under introduction identify the objectives of the study, the research questions, the hypotheses, scope etc. But in this paper hypothesis comes under literature review.</p> <p>(4) The review of related literature should comprise of the overview of Concept of the variables under study, Theoretical framework and empirical study. Empirical review should come under review of related literature not under introduction.</p> <p>(5) Referencing should follow APA 6<sup>TH</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> edition method. Again, the referencing of <a href="http://www.internetworldstats.com">www.internetworldstats.com</a> is not acceptable; you cannot reference internet-world because it is not authority.</p>	<p>1. Ok</p> <p>2. Ok</p> <p>3. Done. I put Hypotheses in the last paragraph of Introduction</p> <p>4. Done</p> <p>5. Done</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	I am not discuss about ethical issues. I will consider your advice for next research

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>