

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_101866
Title of the Manuscript:	Legal Analysis in The Settlement of SHM Forgery Crimes That Result in Losses to Other Parties is Associated with (Study of Decision Number 252/Pid. B/2015/ PN. PMS) in Indonesia
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	In the current form of the manuscript it is not important as its quality is very, very, very poor. It could be important as it presents an interesting problem.  Yes, it is.  Yes, it is.  Yes, they are.  The methods use are scientifically correct. The study's execution is not scientifically correct as the paper is full of mistakes and repetitions and it is confusing.  Yes, they are.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The paper is chaotic and very confusing. There are numerous repetitions and it is often not clear what the author wanted to state. Detailed comments are to be found in the manuscript.	

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Barbara Wieliczko</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute for Rural and Agricultural Development, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland</b>