

Accountability, transparency, and community trust in Indonesian village government: Does corruption perception matter?

No	Comments	Action to do
Reviewer 1 comments		
<p>This paper is focused on the role of accountability and transparency in community trust considering corruption perception for Indonesian local governments. The paper fits the aims of the journal but in my opinion the paper has some problems that hinder the publication of the paper. My main concern is about the source of data used for the analysis, as I will explain later, which reduces the contribution of the paper. I would like to highlight the following weaknesses and points of the article that I think should be revised before its publication:</p>		
1	<p>Objectives of the paper: The objectives of the paper should be clearly defined in the introduction (and through the paper), that is, what are the research questions.</p>	<p>We added Research aim and research questions of the paper explicitly in the introduction part</p>
2	<p>Literature Review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The review of literature should be expanded to accountability and transparency issues, that at the moment is mainly focused on the issues of decentralization of government. 2. Also the application of stakeholder theory to the analysis carried out should be expanded. How it can influence on the role of accountability and transparency for community trust? 3. The hypotheses should be also better justified with the theoretical framework and previous literature. The legitimacy theory can be useful in this respect. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We added literature review about accountability and transparency 2. We elaborated stakeholder theory, especially regarding the role of accountability towards trust. We also added legitimacy theory as reviewer advised 3. We have highlighted theoretical lens and previous research results in hypotheses development, but it is only in brief due to word limit rule applied by FAAM journal. We also added legitimacy theory in this section.
3	Results:	

No	Comments	Action to do
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This section describes the results of statistical analysis that I consider is well developed. However, due to the problems in the data source the contribution of the analysis is scarce. 2. On the other hand, I think that the paper lacks the discussion of the results considering the theoretical framework. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have justified about the reviewers comment related this issue above, point number 4. We would say that we have followed robust research methodology in executing our research. However, in case that this paper has a weakness as a default in the methodology used, we do not deny that. 2. We amended and elaborate more the discussion from theoretical framework lens. We added a new sub title, namely Theoretical implications
<p>Reviewer 2 Comments</p>		
<p>Many thanks for giving me the opportunity to review this research. I think that is covers a very relevant topic.</p>		
1	<p>The research is clear concise and methodologically appropriate. The research is completed and in my opinion it is ready to be publish.</p>	<p>Thank you very much. No revision is required.</p>