

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

Mohammad Heydari¹

¹ Tongji University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear respected authors;

I have carefully reviewed the submitted manuscript titled "[*Political Economy and Ecology of International Regional Development: Indonesia Urban and Rural Development Loans from the Asian Development Bank (ADB)*]". While the authors have put forth a significant effort in their work, it is regrettable to conclude that the current state of the manuscript falls short of the necessary scientific standards required for publication. Therefore, I recommend rejecting the manuscript for the following reasons:

1. Lack of Clear Structure and Organization:

The manuscript lacks a coherent and well-defined structure. The introduction does not sufficiently set the context or rationale for the study, and the flow of information throughout the paper is inconsistent and confusing. A clear and logical organization is essential for readers to follow the research progression and conclusions.

2. Inadequate Literature Review:

The literature review provided is limited in scope and fails to adequately address the existing body of knowledge in the field. Relevant prior research is missing, and the connections between the current study and previous works are unclear. A comprehensive and well-documented literature review is crucial for establishing the novelty and significance of the research.

3. Methodological Flaws:

The methodology section is insufficiently detailed, making it difficult for other researchers to replicate the study. Key methodological components, such as sample selection, data collection, and analysis procedures, are not adequately described. Additionally, there are potential issues with the research design that raise concerns about the validity and reliability of the findings.

4. Lack of Rigorous Analysis:

The data analysis and interpretation presented in the manuscript are not conducted with the rigor required for a scientific publication. The statistical methods used are not adequately explained, and the results are often presented without proper context or discussion. A thorough and robust analysis is necessary to support the conclusions drawn from the research.

5. Insufficient Conclusions and Implications:

The conclusions drawn from the study are not well-supported by the presented evidence. The manuscript lacks a comprehensive discussion of the implications of the findings and their broader significance in the field. The implications for theory, practice, and future research need to be clearly articulated.

6. Inadequate References and Citations:

The references cited in the manuscript are sparse and do not encompass relevant and recent contributions in the field. Proper citation of existing literature is essential for contextualizing the research within the broader scholarly discourse.

Recommendation:

Based on the aforementioned shortcomings in the manuscript's scientific shape, I recommend that the submitted manuscript be rejected for publication. The authors are advised to address the issues outlined above through substantial revisions and improvements before considering resubmission to a scientific journal. I appreciate the authors' dedication to their research and encourage them to seek guidance from colleagues and experts to enhance the quality of their work.

Sincerely,