

Dear Authors:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Millah: Journal of Religious Studies, "Public Animo in the 2020 Governor Election in the Covid-19 Pandemic Era: Religious and Cultural Approaches".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Please kindly revise the manuscript within a week following reviewers' comments below. Please kindly provide us with a separated Word file describing your response to reviewers' comments.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Originality. Does the manuscript contain new and significant information that is suitable for publication?

Good

Relationships with the relevant literature. Has the manuscript demonstrated the author's understanding of the relevant literature in the related field and has cited adequate literature sources? Is there any literature that is relevant to the study in the manuscript that was missed?

Need Improve

Methodology. Are the arguments in the text built on sufficient theory, concept, or idea? Are the methods used adequate?

Good

Result. Are the results clearly presented and analysed adequately? Are the conclusions drawn in accordance with the discussion in the text?

Need improve

Implications. Does the manuscript clearly state the implications of the findings for follow-up research or theory development or on society? If it has mentioned implications, are the implications of the manuscript consistent with the results and conclusions?

Need improve

Clarity of communication. Is the manuscript written clearly so that it is easily digested by journal readers? Is the use of language in the text adequate?

Need improve

Comments for manuscript improvement:

The detail of comment are attached in file

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Decline Submission

Originality. Does the manuscript contain new and significant information that is suitable for publication?

Research related to Covid-19 is outdated so this article does not have an element of novelty

Relationships with the relevant literature. Has the manuscript demonstrated the author's understanding of the relevant literature in the related field and has cited adequate literature sources? Is there any literature that is relevant to the study in the manuscript that was missed?

The literature is appropriate to the topic being researched, but there is no literature to build a framework for thinking so it is necessary to add literature related to the approach used

Methodology. Are the arguments in the text built on sufficient theory, concept, or idea? Are the methods used adequate?

The author seems unable to differentiate what a research approach is and the theories and concepts used to explain the phenomenon do not yet exist. The implication is that the analysis carried out to look at the relationship between general elections and Covid-19 is not yet in-depth.

Result. Are the results clearly presented and analysed adequately? Are the conclusions drawn in accordance with the discussion in the text?

Because the theory or concept used does not yet exist so the conclusions obtained are less in-depth. However, the conclusions presented are in accordance with the discussion in the text.

Implications. Does the manuscript clearly state the implications of the findings for follow-up research or theory development or on society? If it has mentioned implications, are the implications of the manuscript consistent with the results and conclusions?

I don't think there is anything new in this research that can be used for developing theory or future research.

Clarity of communication. Is the manuscript written clearly so that it is easily digested by journal readers? Is the use of language in the text adequate?

The writing is easy for readers to understand and has a good flow and neat arrangement according to the established template.

Comments for manuscript improvement:

1. The topic of discussion needs to be updated
2. It is necessary to build a framework for thinking based on theories or concepts so that the discussion can be more in-depth.
3. It is necessary to add a discussion of previous literature to look for GAPs from previous research
4. Added literature about the theory or concept that will be used

Reviewer F:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Originality. Does the manuscript contain new and significant information that is suitable for publication?

The manuscript is original, and it is suitable for publication

Relationships with the relevant literature. Has the manuscript demonstrated the author's understanding of the relevant literature in the related field and has cited adequate literature sources? Is there any literature that is relevant to the study in the manuscript that was missed?

The author needs to establish a framework regarding the various strategies employed by religious and community leaders in integrating religious and cultural approaches into the election process

Methodology. Are the arguments in the text built on sufficient theory, concept, or idea? Are the methods used adequate?

Very few concepts and theories are explained in the literature review, so it does not cover data collection from voters. The method used is adequate, but the author needs to use one more research instrument, a questionnaire.

Result. Are the results clearly presented and analysed adequately? Are the conclusions drawn in accordance with the discussion in the text?

To understand the high voter interest in the 2020 governor election in Central Kalimantan, the author needs to compare data from different sources such as voters, religious leaders, and community leaders is crucial. This approach helps uncover various factors influencing voter engagement.

Implications. Does the manuscript clearly state the implications of the findings for follow-up research or theory development or on society? If it has mentioned implications, are the implications of the manuscript consistent with the results and conclusions?

The manuscript mentioned implication clearly

Clarity of communication. Is the manuscript written clearly so that it is easily digested by journal readers? Is the use of language in the text adequate?

The language is not really clear and understandable

Comments for manuscript improvement:

The author needs to add data from voters

Reviewer M:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Originality. Does the manuscript contain new and significant information that is suitable for publication?

public animo is a new term for me but the author unable to define what is a public animo and frame it in a specific context so the reader can easily grasp it. the author should define the term early in the paper for better reading comprehension. despite the term seems to be something important in this paper however the author only uses the term 10 times throughout the paper. please define the term or remove it for clarity purposes. placing the term public animo in the keyword without precisely explaining it is pointless.

perhaps the author should rewrite this article in a more narrative style rather than stacking citations over citations which eliminates the storytelling element in a qualitative paper. for example, the author starts off with a series of citations for something that can be generally explained. it looks academic but it is because of the citation the key for a Scopus-level paper is to make the paper readable and cohesive.

While the manuscript offers a detailed examination of the Central Kalimantan context, its originality is somewhat limited by its reliance on conventional qualitative methodologies and existing theoretical frameworks without significant adaptation or innovation. The study does not introduce new theories or propose modifications to existing ones, which might limit its appeal to a wider academic audience looking for groundbreaking research. Moreover, the manuscript could benefit from incorporating comparisons with other regions or crises, which would enhance its originality and contribute new dimensions to the existing body of knowledge.

Relationships with the relevant literature. Has the manuscript demonstrated the author's understanding of the relevant literature in the related field and has cited adequate literature sources? Is there any literature that is relevant to the study in the manuscript that was missed?

Despite its thorough engagement with traditional sources, the manuscript overlooks crucial contemporary literature on digital engagement and social media's role in modern electoral processes, which is particularly pertinent given the constraints imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic. The omission of this body of work represents a significant gap, especially as digital platforms have become critical to understanding changes in political behavior and electoral engagement in today's interconnected world.

Methodology. Are the arguments in the text built on sufficient theory, concept, or idea? Are the methods used adequate?

While the phenomenological approach suits the study's objectives, the manuscript provides insufficient detail about the methodological execution—particularly in how participants were chosen, the criteria for data saturation, and the specific steps taken during thematic analysis. This lack of detail may raise questions about the study's methodological rigor and the replicability of its findings.

Result. Are the results clearly presented and analysed adequately? Are the conclusions drawn in accordance with the discussion in the text?

Despite the clarity in presentation, the results are predominantly descriptive with limited analytical depth. The study fails to engage critically with its own findings to explore wider implications or contradictions within the data. The conclusions, while consistent with the discussion, are somewhat predictable and do not challenge or expand the theoretical framework in a meaningful way. A more rigorous analytical approach could have strengthened the impact of the results and offered more substantial contributions to the field.

Implications. Does the manuscript clearly state the implications of the findings for follow-up research or theory development or on society? If it has mentioned implications, are the implications of the manuscript consistent with the results and conclusions?

While the practical implications are well-articulated, the manuscript does not delve deeply into the theoretical implications of its findings. It misses an opportunity to discuss how these results might prompt revisions to existing theories of voter behavior or contribute to new theoretical developments. Additionally, the implications for broader societal impacts or international contexts are not thoroughly explored, which could limit the manuscript's relevance and applicability beyond its specific study region.

Clarity of communication. Is the manuscript written clearly so that it is easily digested by journal readers? Is the use of language in the text adequate?

The manuscript occasionally lapses into dense academic jargon and complex sentence structures that may not be easily understandable to all potential readers, including those outside the immediate field of political science or from non-academic backgrounds. Simplifying the language and avoiding unnecessary jargon would make the article more accessible to a broader audience, including practitioners and policymakers who could benefit from its findings.

Comments for manuscript improvement:

To enhance the quality and impact of the manuscript, the author should consider addressing the gaps in digital engagement literature, adding methodological details, critically analyzing the results to explore broader implications, discussing theoretical advancements based on the findings, and improving the readability by simplifying the language. These changes would not only strengthen the academic rigor of the manuscript but also increase its practical relevance and accessibility.

The manuscript focuses on the role of religious leaders and cultural practices in influencing voter behavior during elections in a specific region (Central Kalimantan) during the COVID-19 pandemic. While the paper discusses religious influences, it is crucial to assess whether these discussions are central to the paper or simply one

aspect of a broader sociopolitical analysis. If the religious elements are integral and thoroughly analyzed in the context of religious studies, this could make it relevant for a religious journal.

Reviewer S:
Recommendation: Decline Submission

Originality. Does the manuscript contain new and significant information that is suitable for publication?

1. Based on our evaluation, we found that this manuscript does not contain new and significant information worthy of publication. The study you presented has been extensively discussed in previous research, and we did not find any notable new contributions. We suggest that you review the manuscript and consider adding new data or perspectives that can strengthen the originality and relevance of your research before resubmitting it for consideration.

Relationships with the relevant literature. Has the manuscript demonstrated the author's understanding of the relevant literature in the related field and has cited adequate literature sources? Is there any literature that is relevant to the study in the manuscript that was missed?

The manuscript does not demonstrate the author's understanding of the relevant literature in the related field and lacks adequate citation of appropriate sources. Additionally, there is no clear theoretical framework utilized in analyzing this research.

Methodology. Are the arguments in the text built on sufficient theory, concept, or idea? Are the methods used adequate?

The methodology used in the manuscript is inadequate and lacks structure. There is a need for a more detailed and coherent methodological framework. Additionally, the criteria and rationale for selecting informants are not provided, which raises concerns about the representativeness and reliability

Result. Are the results clearly presented and analysed adequately? Are the conclusions drawn in accordance with the discussion in the text?

The results presented contain many points, but each point is not thoroughly explained. It is essential to provide a more comprehensive and detailed discussion for each point to ensure clarity and completeness in the presentation of your findings.

Implications. Does the manuscript clearly state the implications of the findings for follow-up research or theory development or on society? If it has mentioned implications, are the implications of the manuscript consistent with the results and conclusions?

no clear. I did not find any implications of this research. It is important to discuss the practical, theoretical, or policy implications of your findings to highlight the significance and potential impact of your study.

Clarity of communication. Is the manuscript written clearly so that it is easily digested by journal readers? Is the use of language in the text adequate?

"The language used in your writing is of poor quality. Please improve the grammar, spelling, and writing style to meet the expected standards."

Comments for manuscript improvement:

After careful consideration, I regret to inform you that your article does not meet the overall standards of the journal. I encourage you to address areas of concern based on reviewer suggestions and input.
