SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_SAJSSE_139700**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Mediating Role of Public Service Quality in the Relationship Between Sectoral Budget Allocations and Human Development Index in Langkat Regency, Indonesia**
Type of Article :	

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	**Authors' response to final evaluator's comments**
Parts that have not been revised properly: 1. Literature review section is missing. It should as a separate section, and not included in the Introduction section, so that the introduction can be focused on the general idea and novelty of the paper. 2. The reference: "Badan Pusat Statistik" in the reference list should be consistent with the reference in the text 3. It is still not clear what is x1.1, x1.2,…, x2.1, x2.2,… and so on 4. Most of the references are not from reputable peer reviewed international journals 5. Some typos or glitches in language have not been revised: for example, 3.2 Demografi…. 6. The symbols of variables have not been replaced by more meaningful letters (instead of using generic X and Y letters normally used in textbooks). For example: ee for education expenditure, he for health expenditure, and ie for infrastructure expenditure 7. Sub section 3.2 is still not very relevant with the analysis in the study. It should be replaced by for example: detailed discussion on how the Langkat Regency delivers the education, health, and infrastructure expenditure along with the detail of the quality of public service found from the surveys of from interviews 8. Some aspects of respondents (in sub-section 3.3) are still not clearly described. For example: what Division Heads are exactly, what key department officials are exactly, Head of the Public Works Department is exactly (national or regional level), officials from organization bureau are exactly, 9. Sub sections "3.3.1 By Gender" and "3.3.2 By Age" are still not very relevant with the analysis. Since respondents are not homogenous (coming from the same occupation or economic actor), gender and age are not very relevant. Years of service might be more relevant, because the position has already shown the capacity anyway. In addition, valid percent and cumulative percent columns are not necessary here. 10. The meaning of direct and indirect effect should be clearly defined since the paper mentions that the relationships between expenditure (X) and public service quality (Z) as direct paths (for example, in Table 9), while it is not literally direct because Z is considered as a mediating variable. 11. Page number is missing 12. Section 3.4 mentions that each indicator has the highest loading on its intended construct compared to its correlation with other constructs. The example is only provided for X1.1 while the table may show different findings for other indicators. 13. Figures are not properly referred to in the text 14. In Table 8, X1, X2, and X3 significantly influence Y (the P values are 0), but the H2 is rejected.	

SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 3: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS for this REVISED manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this REVISED manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) **Guideline:** Accept (8-10) Revision required: (4-8) Rejected: (0-4)	**7**