

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEBA_128775
Title of the Manuscript:	Intellectual Capital for Improving the Performance of Public Listed State-Owned Enterprises in The Digital Society Era
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the Intellectual capital of SOEs. The study contributes to the ongoing discussion on SOEs in Indonesia. More comparative analysis could strengthen the manuscript's relevance to a broader audience	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title "Intellectual Capital for Improving the Performance of Public Listed State-Owned Enterprises in The Digital Society Era" does not convey the main focus of the study, highlighting the key variables involved. It should be "Impact of Intellectual Capital on the performance of SOEs in the Digital Society Era in Indonesia"	Revised

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract effectively summarizes the research but could be enhanced by providing more detail on the methodology, particularly regarding data collection and data analysis. It is important to maintain consistency in terminology throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript includes the necessary subsections; however, it could be further enhanced by addressing the following areas:</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> <b>Comment:</b> The introduction currently lacks a clear and concise <b>problem statement</b>, which is essential for framing the study's significance and context. A well-defined problem statement articulates the specific issue or gap in the existing literature that the research seeks to address. Including this element will help readers understand the motivation behind the study and the relevance of the research questions being explored. It is recommended to clearly outline the problem that necessitates this research, as well as its implications for the field.</p> <p><b>Literature Review</b> <b>Comment:</b> Before discussing subsections like Intellectual capital it is essential to include a dedicated <b>Literature Review</b> section that establishes a foundation for the subsequent discussions. This section should articulate the hypotheses clearly and integrate them with relevant theories and existing research, thereby strengthening the connection between theoretical frameworks and empirical investigations. Additionally, a more comprehensive explanation of the theoretical framework underpinning the relationships among the variables.</p> <p><b>Research Methodology</b> <b>Comment:</b> The methodology is briefly described, but it would benefit from greater clarity and detail.</p> <p><b>Data Collection</b> <b>Comment:</b> <b>The data set is not clearly mentioned.</b></p> <p><b>Data Analysis</b> <b>Comment:</b> Please verify whether the <b>explanation</b> should typically come before or after the <b>table/figure</b>. It is important to ensure consistency with academic standards. Generally, the explanation <b>often comes first</b>, providing context for the reader, followed by the table or figure for visual support. This approach helps the reader understand the data's relevance before engaging with the detailed information. However, some formats may prefer the data presentation first, depending on the journal's guidelines.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> <b>Comment:</b> The discussion effectively ties the findings back to the literature, particularly highlighting the positive impact of intellectual capital SOEs performance. However, it would benefit from being more explicitly guided by the <b>research objectives and research questions</b>. Structuring the discussion around these elements will provide a clearer focus and ensure that the analysis remains aligned with the study's original aims. Additionally, the discussion would be strengthened by incorporating more <b>recent citations</b> to reflect the latest developments in the field.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> <b>Comment:</b> The conclusion section currently lacks citations to support the recommendations for Practitioners</p>	<p>Noted and effected</p> <p>Revision made</p> <p>Correction made</p> <p>Ok</p>
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The references are relevant but not updated, with many sources from before 2021. Including more recent research would improve the relevance of the study. Update the reference list with recent studies, especially those published within the last three to five years.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>Language/English Quality</b> The language is generally not suitable for scholarly communication, there are some spelling errors such as "pulic". A thorough proofreading is recommended to correct these issues.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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