Dr. Ngakan Ketut Acwin Dwijendra. ST., MA. <acwin@unud.ac.id>

LHQR0045 - Status of Manuscript

1 pesan

Asian Institute of Research <editorial@asianinstituteofresearch.org> 28 April 2022 11.00
Kepada: "Dr. Ngakan Ketut Acwin Dwijendra. ST., MA." <acwin@unud.ac.id>

Dear Erikson Sihotang, Ngakan Ketut Acwin Dwijendra, H. Nurianto RS, Ni Ketut Wiratny,

Congratulations! The feedback on your submitted manuscript has been attained (file attached). As the paper fulfills the threshold of reviewers, your manuscript can now be published. Before doing so, please read the following points carefully:

1. Published Paper
Your paper will be published in the **Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews** (10-15 days after payment). If you would like to make any changes to the affiliations of the authors, please do so immediately and send back the file to us. Please ensure that you have sent the complete details of all the author's affiliations and email address if you wish your profile to be updated in the SSRN database. Your article will be prepared for publication in **Vol.5 No.2 June 2022**, with the article published online immediately after payment in the form of *E-Version first*.

2. Publication Payment
Please continue to conduct payment for the publication of your manuscript. The publication fee is USD 175 with the addition of 4% for the Paypal transaction fee, and must be completed within a week from this date. We accept payments through Paypal, in which you have the right to complete payment through your Paypal Account, or Debit/ Credit Card (if you do not have an account). Please find the online invoice to complete the payment:
https://www.paypal.com/invoice/p/#SFWGVYJHRZ5KVQZ4

If Paypal is not available in your country, you may proceed with the payments via (wise.com), to the following email: editorial@asianinstituteofresearch.org. The amount paid should be in USD currency.

3. Author Photo
Please send us a picture of the main author (please do not send pictures of other authors) so that we can publish your research on our website, complete with the author profile picture.

Regards,
Editorial Team

LHQR0045 manuscript review.pdf
113K

ID Number: **LHQR0045**

Author: [undisclosed]
Affiliation: [undisclosed]
Title: Improving the Morals and Ethics of Law Enforcement in Indonesia

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW FORM
Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews
Reviewer: [undisclosed]

SECTION I: General Assessment (*Please rate the manuscript based on your critical assessment, with a tick 'X' in the appropriate box below*)

View of the Reviewers	1	2	3	4	Does Not Apply
The Manuscript provides a contribution to the research area regarding a new finding, interpretation and/or point of view			X		
The title of the manuscript is appropriate, and the title reflects the content of the manuscript		X			
There is a balanced relationship between the objective, content, and the conclusion of the manuscript		X			
The research methods and the data collection techniques are relevant to the objective and adequately explained		X			
The manuscript is precise and well-written			X		
The figures, tables and graphs are relevant.		X			
The references are adequate, convenient and up-to-date.			X		
The manuscript complies with academic ethical rules		X			
The aim/argument/hypothesis is clear and well-discussed.		X			
The results of the analysis are correctly interpreted		X			
The manuscript is free of issues of grammar, punctuation and such.		X			

(1 = Poor) (2 =Fair) (3 = Good) (4 =Excellent)

SECTION II: Evaluation Criteria (*Please give your critical comments for the deficiencies of the manuscript*)

Evaluation Criteria	Comments
1. Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding When considering the Thematic Focus and Empirical Grounding, please use the following prompts to guide your overall response and evaluation: • Is this a topic that needs addressing? • Is the area investigated by the article: significant? Timely? Important? In need of addressing because it has been neglected? Intrinsically interesting? Filling a gap of current knowledge? • Are data collection processes, textual analyses of exegeses of practice sufficient and adequate to answer the research questions? • Does the article adequately document, acknowledge, and reference the existing findings, research, practices, and literature in its field? • Does the article relate in a coherent and cogent way with issues of real-world significance?	The author provides convincing arguments to the question of whether this topic needs to be addressed or not, along with the case for the novelty of the study case to the related discourse. This article elaborates the discourse of the law enforcement, linked to the variables of the research. Furthermore, the article provides adequate documents, acknowledgement, and references to existing findings, research, practices, and literature of the field. Conclusion: I highly recommend the publication of this article, as it satisfies the basic standards of thematic focus and empirical grounding, conceptual model, explanatory logic, implication and applications, and last, quality of communication.

2. Conceptual Model When considering the Conceptual Model, please use the following prompts to guide your overall response and evaluation. • Are the main concepts or categories appropriate to the investigation? • Should other concepts or categories have been considered? • Are key concepts adequately defined? Are they used consistently? • Does the article make necessary or appropriate connections with existing theory? • Does the article develop, apply, and test a coherent and cogent theoretical position or conceptual model?	The article develops and applies a coherent and cogent theoretical position, elaborated throughout the article.
3. Explanatory Logic When considering the Explanatory Logic, please use the following prompts to guide your overall response and evaluation. • How effectively does the article reason from its empirical reference points? • Are the conclusions drawn from the data, texts, sources, or represented objects clear and insightful? Do they effectively advance the themes that the article sets out to address? • Does the article demonstrate a critical awareness of alternative or competing perspectives, approaches, and paradigms? • Is the author conscious of his or her own premises and perhaps the limitations of his or her perspectives and knowledge-making processes?	The author demonstrates critical awareness of alternative perspectives that could be implemented, along with alternative approaches to the study cases.
4. Implications and Applications When considering the Implications and Applications, please use the following prompts to guide your overall response and evaluation. • Does the article demonstrate the direct or indirect applicability, relevance, or effectiveness of the practice or object it analyzes? • Are its implications practicable? • Are its recommendations realistic? • Does the article make an original contribution to knowledge? • To what extent does it break new intellectual ground? • Does it suggest innovative applications? • What are its prospects for broader applicability or appreciation? • How might its vision for the world be realized more widely?	The implications and applications of the research falls under the category of being practical, realistic, and clearly provides original contribution to the stated study.
5. Quality of Communication When considering the Implications and Applications, please use the following prompts to guide your overall response and evaluation. • Is the focus of the article clearly stated (for instance, the problem, issue, or object under investigation; the research question; or the theoretical problem)? • Does the article clearly express its case, measured against the standards of the technical language of its field and the reading capacities of audiences academic, tertiary student, and professional? • What is the standard of the writing, including spelling and grammar? • If necessary, please make specific suggestions or annotate errors in the text.	The quality of communication clearly expresses the case, as well as measured against standards of the technical language of the field. I recommend the publication of this article, as it satisfies the basic criteria of the journal publication.

SECTION III: Recommendation (*Kindly mark with an 'X'*)

Accept the manuscript as submitted	
Accept the manuscript with minor editorial proofreading	X
Accept the manuscript with minor substantive revisions	
Accept the manuscript with major substantive revisions	
Reject the manuscript because it does not fulfill the journal criteria	