

Peer Review

Review of: "Evaluation of Indonesia's Scientific Publication Performance: Quantity, Quality, Open Access, and Comparison with ASEAN Countries"

Mahfooz Ahmed¹

1. Gulf University, Sanad, Bahrain

The most compelling aspect of this study lies in its emphasis on the **quality** of publications, as opposed to the more commonly prioritized **quantity**, which tends to dominate the agenda of research institutions in many developing countries. This focus provides a valuable perspective on research performance evaluation, especially in contexts where systemic limitations may constrain output volume.

You made a significant and insightful claim in the following paragraph, which would benefit from proper referencing for validation and credibility:

"In a regional context, ASEAN provides a relevant landscape for comparison. Countries such as Singapore and Malaysia, for example, have shown high achievements in terms of publication quality, despite having smaller quantities than Indonesia. On the other hand, countries such as Vietnam, Thailand, and the Philippines share a number of structural challenges with Indonesia, ranging from limited research funding to a lack of an open publication culture."

Please consider including citations from reputable regional studies or databases to support this comparative statement.

Additionally, I suggest using the word "**section**" instead of "**chapter**" in the following sentence for accuracy and consistency with journal article format:

"3. Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings of the data analysis and interpretation.... presented in this chapter aims not only to illustrate..."

Moreover, since the study has already been conducted and the findings are being reported, the verb tense should be consistently written in the **past tense**. For example:

- “The discussion focused on aspects of open access..”
- “Therefore, the discussion highlighted several key aspects that required systematic attention.”

For **Figure 1**, it would strengthen the argument if **Indonesia** is clearly indicated or labeled to support the claim that:

“Figure 1 shows that most countries have an OA ratio between 0.6 and 0.9. Indonesia is considered one of the countries with the highest OA ratio, at 0.93..”

This visual clarification would allow readers to verify and contextualize the claim more effectively.

It is also advisable to specify the **date or range** during which the data were extracted from <https://www.scilit.com/>, as data on this platform are updated frequently and may vary over time. Including this information would enhance the study’s transparency and reproducibility.

Lastly, the article would benefit from a brief paragraph discussing the **limitations of the study**, such as potential biases in the OA data source, generalizability across disciplines, or data volatility. Acknowledging these limitations would provide direction for future research and highlight the study’s academic rigor.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this valuable work.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.