

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJESS_122941 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Pattern of Industrial Relations After The Enactment of The Omnibus Law During The Covid-19 Pandemic |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|---|
| 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. | This manuscript holds significant relevance for the scientific community as it addresses the intricate dynamics of industrial relations during a particularly tumultuous period in Indonesia, shaped by both the COVID-19 pandemic and the enactment of the Omnibus Law. The study provides valuable insights into how these dual challenges have reshaped the employer-employee relationship, making it a critical reference for understanding labor practices in crisis scenarios. The comprehensive analysis of the industrial patterns post-Omnibus Law is especially pertinent, offering a nuanced perspective that could inform both policy and academic discourse. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title of the article is fairly descriptive; however, it might benefit from being more specific. An alternative title could be: "Evolving Industrial Relations in Indonesia: Impact of the Omnibus Law Amidst the COVID-19 Pandemic." | |
| 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. | The abstract generally provides a good overview of the study, but it could be more concise and focused. I suggest emphasizing the key findings and implications more clearly, such as the shift from "rights disputes" to "interest disputes" post-Omnibus Law. Additionally, the abstract could benefit from a brief mention of the methodological approach and the broader implications of the study for future research and policy-making. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriately organized, allowing the reader to follow the progression of the study logically. The division into introduction, methods, results, and discussion is clear and effective. However, the results and discussion sections could be more tightly integrated to highlight the study's key findings in the context of the existing literature. | |
| 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. | The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound, as it thoroughly investigates the industrial relations landscape through a well-structured qualitative approach. The use of purposive sampling and in-depth interviews adds depth to the findings, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are grounded in solid empirical data. The study's exploration of the transition from rights disputes to interest disputes following the Omnibus Law is particularly insightful and well-supported by the data. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. : | The references are adequate and include a mix of recent and relevant sources that support the study's arguments. However, it may be beneficial to include more recent studies that discuss the broader impacts of COVID-19 on industrial relations globally, to contextualize the findings within a larger framework. | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language used in the manuscript is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sentences could be revised for clarity and conciseness. A thorough proofreading is recommended to ensure the manuscript meets the highest standards of academic writing. | |
| Optional/General comments | NONE | |

Review Form 3

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: | Kenth Joshua B. Espina |
| Department, University & Country | Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology, Philippines |