

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_126942
Title of the Manuscript:	Artificial Intelligence in The Perspective of Indonesian Law: Subject or Object of Law?
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (<i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i>)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Review of Ms_AJESS_126942 Abstract and Introduction Strengths: The abstract concisely captures the key of the research question-whether AI should be treated as a subject or object of the law in Indonesia-and touches on potential legal consequences. The introduction contextualizes well the issue within Indonesia's current legal framework and identifies the lack of AI-specific regulation. Limitations: The abstract would do much better if it specified the scope of the literature review <i>Cumhur Cavaliers</i> and identified which major legal documents and international frameworks compare. The introduction should, therefore, be more explicit in the statement of the research question to guide readers through what objectives this article is going to achieve. Methodology Strengths: The methodology is clearly outlined and suitable for the research goals set by the authors. A normative legal approach-the contents of law-appropriately brings in a comparative analysis to work out the legal constructs. Limitations: The article would benefit from clarifying how data was selected and analyzed in comparative jurisdictions, such as the EU's AI Act. Additional justification for choosing certain international frameworks or countries for comparison could enhance the methodological rigor. Literature Review Strengths: The literature review is comprehensive in referencing a range of sources from Indonesia and other jurisdictions. It effectively frames the debate by presenting varying perspectives on AI being viewed as a legal subject versus a legal object through drawing from Indonesian and international literature. Limitations: While the literature review covers a wide variety of perspectives, it should be more critical in its assessment of the various contributions that each of these studies makes to its core Indonesia context. A deeper look at how those international frameworks may align or differ with Indonesian legal principles would enable an even stronger analysis. Discussion and Analysis Strengths: The discussion entertained by the paper on the possible legal status of AI in Indonesia is quite thorough, to the extent of even comparing AI with other subjects of law, like corporations. For instance, the analogy of AI as a "worker" under Article 1367 of the Indonesian Civil Code offers a fresh perspective on liability. Limitations: Although the analogy to a "worker" is an interesting approach, it would be useful if the discussion developed in greater detail how this interpretation fits within Indonesian legal norms. It may also be useful if the article considered some practical issues of how this model would work in action, for example, any concept of "control" over AI when events may be occurring autonomously. Ethical and Legal Risk Mitigation These are its strengths: the article discusses ethical concerns regarding algorithmic bias and privacy; it recognizes the potentiality of AI for violation of rights, albeit unconsciously. Apparently, this strengthens the case for early legal intervention and anticipatory regulation. Limitations: The analysis may include more specific examples of regulatory approaches to algorithmic bias from other countries. The discussion could become more relevant by integrating case studies or examples to drive practical recommendations. Conclusion and Recommendations Strengths: The article concludes by stressing how imperative it would be to devise adaptive legal frameworks-as the sphere of AI's autonomous realm is expanding.</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>This again brings into light the dire necessity of regulating a balance between innovation and protection that pertains specifically to Indonesia's developing AI sector.</p> <p>Limitations: The suggestions could be extended to cover a possible step-by-step approach regarding the introduction of AI regulations. For example, taking into consideration first the recognition of AI as a legal object with human accountability but later, as the technology advances, considering limited liability.</p> <p>Final Evaluation</p> <p>The article is well-structured; it contributes greatly to the legal and ethical ongoing discourse on AI. However, it would be perfected by going further in the methodological clarifications, the critical analysis of the literature, and using practical examples in discussing ethical risks. Other ways the recommendation of the author could be strengthened through phased regulatory steps include taking into consideration Indonesia's current legal landscape and technological development stage. The article was thus very informative, addressed a major research gap, and though there were points to be improved in the methodological realm, it had room for practical applicability.</p>	
--	---	--

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:	R. Shreesha
Department, University & Country	University of Mysore, India