

**Paper: “Philanthropy: A Customary Practice to Meet Donor Expectations Lesson from Islamic NPOs in Indonesia”**

**Submitted: 21 April 2024**

**Accepted: 20 September 2024**

**Published: 30 September 2024**

Corresponding Author: Muji Astuti Rejosumarto

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n25p58

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Akali Agembe  
Kisii University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Dishon Nyaga  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 3: Róbert Szűcs  
University of Debrecen, Hungary

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Accept Submission  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Yes ,the title is ok.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

1.The research needs to be supported by the existing theories relevant to the study.

2.The conceptual constructs needs to come out clear with their indicators clearly shown.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

no its ok

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

yes

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

yes

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

just for the few arreas highlighted above ,the document is ok

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

ok

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

kindly check the conceptual frameworks and the relevant theories to the study

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Title is clear and it's adequate. That's okay

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

Yes the abstract shows the objects, methods and results

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The Grammar is okay

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Yes the study methods are explained clearly

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Yes it's clear

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

Yes it is

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Improve on citation. All the listed references should be quoted in the paper.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The paper is well formulated, improve on the references. Delete the ones not cited in the paper

-----

-----  
Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title "Philanthropy: A Customary Practice to Meet Donor Expectation - Lesson from Islamic NPOs in Indonesia" is clear and accurately reflects the content of the article. It encapsulates the main focus of the study, which is on philanthropy practices within Islamic NPOs in Indonesia. However, it could be slightly more concise to improve clarity.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract effectively outlines the objectives, methods, and key findings of the study. It provides a good summary of the research focus, methodology (qualitative with semi-structured interviews), and the main conclusions about the strategic role and improvements needed in Islamic NPOs. However, it is quite dense and could benefit from more explicit mention of key results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

The article contains some grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that can interrupt the flow of reading. For instance, the abstract and some sections have punctuation issues and run-on sentences. A thorough proofreading would improve the overall readability.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods section is comprehensive, detailing the qualitative approach, sample selection, and data collection techniques. It explains the use of semi-structured interviews and content analysis thoroughly. However, more detailed information on the interview process and the specific questions used could enhance clarity.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The results are presented clearly, with comprehensive discussion and relevant data to support the findings. The use of financial performance data and qualitative insights from interviews helps substantiate the conclusions. However, some parts are dense with information, which could be better organized for clarity.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusions are well-supported by the findings presented in the article. They accurately reflect the research conducted and provide clear insights into the challenges and improvements needed for Islamic NPOs. The summary effectively encapsulates the key points discussed throughout the paper.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references are extensive and relevant to the topic. They include a mix of foundational texts and recent studies, providing a strong background and context for the research. The sources are appropriately cited and reflect a wide range of perspectives on philanthropy and NPO management.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Overall, the article is well-researched and informative, though it could benefit from some improvements in language and organization for better clarity and readability.

-----