

---

## [ijcjs] Editor Decision

1 message

---

Editor Versita <submissions@versita.com >

Fri, August 5, 2022 at 5:29

PM To: Siti Marwiyah <iyat\_ss@yahoo.com>, Abdul Kadir Jaelani <jaelaniabdulkadir@staff.uns.ac.id>

Siti Marwiyah, M. Syahrul Borman, Achmad Rubaie, Bahrul Amiq

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Baltic Journal of Law & Politics, "Implications of the Constitutional Court's Decision on Corruption Management Politics in Indonesia".

Our decision is to: Revision Submission

-----  
Reviewer A :

1. Components like a problem statement, literature review, methodology, research objectives, Theoretical framework, results & findings ,etc. It is difficult to determine what your research objectives are, and where you collected data from. In short, what makes this paper a research study. The author doesn't seem to have any motivation .
2. The abstract should contain a research background, purpose, method, findings, and implications for research and practice.
3. The background is not worthy of an introduction because it has not disclosed the legal issues and research gaps.
4. Please clarify again regarding legal issues and state-of-the-art research.
5. This section should have a background and historical data; rationale of the study. It may contain a problems statement: highlighting the issue of the study; a conceptual framework showing how you would take up the research forward.
6. The author can also include a few research questions highlighting the objectives of this research e.g. lack of research, not much attention paid on the subject and how this research aimed to fill the research gap.
7. The discussion is lacking relevant subject matter for our audience.
8. The methods/analysis in the manuscript do not appear to be reasonably rigorous (i.e., they are too simplistic and/or vaguely described).
9. The research questions and attending analyses are purely descriptive or insufficiently developed.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

-----  
Reviewer B:

1. There needs to be comparisons from other countries, to see the government's obedience to the Constitutional Court's decision
2. The author has not been able to show the reasons for not complying with the Constitutional Court Ruling. It needs explanation in theory and practice.
3. There needs to be a limitation related to the decisions of the Constitutional Court being examined, whether all decisions of the Constitutional Court or decisions of the Constitutional Court from a certain year.
4. In conclusion, the writer has not answered the research problem and there is no novelty in the conclusion.

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----