

Review of: "Political Economy and Ecology of International Regional Development: Indonesia Urban and Rural Development Loans from the Asian Development Bank (ADB)"

Maria Monagas¹

¹ University of La Laguna

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

After reviewing the article, I consider that this article deserves publishing.

However, some issues and/or proposals are presented that require major changes:

1.- General comments

- The article deals with a current, relevant topic, so its contributions enrich a fundamental aspect in the analysis of the regional economy.
- The title mentions the difference between urban and rural areas (of great relevance in regional and urban economic studies). The reader then expects to find some explicit reference to this distinction in the article. However, this distinction is not mentioned in the study.
- The article includes numerous value judgments. Evaluative expressions are appropriate, and even convenient, but not from the beginning (eg, in the introduction "Development aid was born **inexplicably**.."), or in the section titles. It is appropriate that they be included in the Discussion section or in the Conclusions, after reviewing the literature and reading the results.

2.- Methodology

- In this section it would be necessary to recognize that endogenous development theories also have weaknesses (see Roberta Capello, 2016: *Regional Economics*. Routledge).

3.- Results and Discussion

- In general, it is suggested to reduce value judgments and include more arguments based on the weaknesses of exogenous development theories (see Roberta Capello, 2016: *Regional Economics*. Routledge).
- Value judgments should be removed from the titles of the epigraphs (eg. 3.2. Political Ecology **Plunder**). 3.2.2. **Faulty** Development Theories).

- It is considered that the Results and Discussion section should combine more the literature review with the results obtained. That is, there must be interaction between the literature review and the results obtained in the research. In its current wording it is more of a “Literature Review” section than a Discussion section. A review and/or restructuring is suggested
- The inclusion of a section dedicated to exposing the “Scope and Limitations” of the work is proposed.