

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_90077
Title of the Manuscript:	Representation of the Omnibus Law in The Jakarta Post Article Entitled “Omnibus Law Boosts Indonesian Growth Prospects”
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Respectable authors the comments to your paper are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.- The theoretical framework does not speak of the Omnibus Law, and it is important to have a history of its constitution, approval, advantages and disadvantages supported by the literature, and the impact as a new policy. 2.- It is important to order the items, separate the results from conclusions and discussion of findings, regardless of whether the research is qualitative. 3.- In relation to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) -also called Critical Discourse Study- which is the design used in this analytical research on the discourse it studies, it is important that the discussion and conclusions are primarily oriented towards the way in which the abuse of power social, domination and inequality are practiced, reproduced, by texts and speech in the social and political context, contrasting with other countries. 4.- It is suggested to order the tables with titles that better describe the analyzed process and place the source or sources at the bottom of the table, as well as describe the table at the beginning, not at the end, as it is presented. 5.- There must be important differences in the tables presented by the authors, as opposed to the appendix, because it seems that there is no documentary research, defining what is the information that was constructed with the literature review and that of the article on which they are based. 6.- It is recommended to make the conclusion based on whether the stated objective was met and new findings, and the impact the authors obtained 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.- The appendix is not clear, what is the purpose of repeating the tables and why it is. 2.- It is recommended to make a table or chart that explains the methodology used, what information, from where the information, qualitatively and the variables used. 	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Corina Flores Hernández
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Guanajuato, Mexico