

Result of Review

Title: Characteristic of Weber bureaucracy and its relevance in Indonesia

Author(s): Muhadam Labolo

Decision of Paper Selection

- Accept submission, no revisions required
- Accept submission, revisions required; please revise the paper according to comments
- Revise and resubmit for review
- Decline submission

What should you do? (For accepted papers)

- ✓ Revise the paper according to the comments (if applicable)
- ✓ All authors must agree on the publication, please inform us the agreement by E-mail.
- ✓ You should pay a publication fee of 300.00USD for the paper.
 - ✧ Please find payment information at: www.ccsenet.org/payment
 - ✧ Please notify the editor when payment has been made

Proposed Schedule for Publication

- ✓ Vol. 9, No. 1, January. 2013, if you meet above requirements within 2 weeks.
- ✓ You may also ask to publish the paper later, if you need more time for revision or payment.

Additional Information

- ✓ You will receive two copies (per paper) of printed journal, *free of charge*
- ✓ If you want to buy more printed journals, please contact with the Editor
- ✓ You may download e-journal in PDF from: www.ccsenet.org/ass/ *free of charge*
- ✓ Any questions please contact with the Editor at: ass@ccsenet.org

Comments from Internal Editor

Evaluation	Grade
	Please fill a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1(high to low)
Overall evaluation on the paper	3
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and Readability	2
Soundness of methodology	2
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	4
Comments and Suggestions	
<p>(*) Re-edit the paper according to Paper Submission Guide: www.ccsenet.org/submission</p> <p>() Change the colorful pictures/figures to black-white format</p> <p>() Pictures/figures are not clear, 300 dpi is required</p> <p>() Transform footnotes to endnotes</p> <p>() Resize the tables/figures, to fit in A4 paper</p> <p>() Add DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs. Please see Paper Submission Guide</p>	

Comments from External Reviewers

❖ Evaluation (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor	
Items	Grade
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and Readability	1
Soundness of methodology	1
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	4
❖ Strengths Lots of literature referred	
❖ Weaknesses Sentences not written properly and does not make sense	
❖ Suggestions to Author/s Rewrite all the sentences so that reader can understand what author is suggesting	