



Sriwijaya Law Review &lt;sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id&gt;

---

## [SLRev] Submission Acknowledgement

---

**Sriwijaya Law Review** <sriwijayalawreview@fh.unsri.ac.id>  
To: Febrian Febrian <febrian\_zen@yahoo.com.sg>

20 May 2022 at 09:29

Dear  
Febrian Febrian:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "SINERGITAS SEKRETARIS DPRD TERHADAP FUNGSI LEGISLARIF DAN EKSEKUTIF" to Sriwijaya Law Review. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL:  
<http://journal.fh.unsri.ac.id/index.php/sriwijayalawreview/author/submission/1869>  
Username: ffebrian

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Sriwijaya Law Review  
Sriwijaya Law Review  
Warm Regards,

Nurhidayatuloh  
(SCOPUS ID: 57211560728)  
Managing Editor & Regional Handling Editor for Asia Pacific  
Sriwijaya Law Review Indexed by:  
SCOPUS; SINTA; ASEAN Citation Index; EBSCO; Google Scholar; DOAJ; Indonesian Scientific Journal Database | Member of Crossref  
Faculty of Law, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, 30139, Indonesia. Tel./Fax:  
+62-711 580063 | E-mail: [sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id](mailto:sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id) Homepage:  
<http://journal.fh.unsri.ac.id/index.php/sriwijayalawreview/index>



---

**[SLRev] Editor Decision**

1 message

---

**Sriwijaya Law Review** <sriwijayalawreview@fh.unsri.ac.id>  
Reply-To: Nurhidayatuloh - <nurhidayatuloh@fh.unsri.ac.id>  
To: Febrian Febrian <febrian\_zen@yahoo.com.sg>  
Cc: sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id

16 July 2022 at 04:32

Dear  
Assoc Prof. Dr. Febrian

Your manuscript has been subjected to a double-blind review process by the selected reviewer who is experts in the related fields. Enclosed please find the reports from these reviewers.

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Sriwijaya Law Review, "The Standing of the Secretariat of the Regional People's Representative Assembly in Indonesia: A Paradox?".

Our decision is: Revisions Required

Please note that it is important for you to revise the manuscript according to reviewers' comments and guidelines. Use the TRACK CHANGES feature in MS-Word to make your revisions, and only REVISED your manuscript in the attached name, "Template Febrian" file.

Once you have revised the manuscript, please reply to this email by attaching your 1) revised manuscript (with TRACK CHANGES) and 2) filled revision form that outlines the revisions you have made in regards to the reviewers' comments and guidelines. We hope to receive your revised article no later than 18 July 2022.

Please learn track changes here:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iHLM8ZuYzcc&t=67s>

Thank you very much for submitting your article to the Sriwijaya Law Review.

I look forward to receiving the revised version of your manuscript.  
Warm Regards,


Nurhidayatuloh  
(SCOPUS ID: 57211560728)  
Managing Editor & Regional Handling Editor for Asia Pacific  
Sriwijaya Law Review Indexed by:  
SCOPUS; SINTA; ASEAN Citation Index; EBSCO; Google Scholar; DOAJ; Indonesian Scientific Journal Database | Member of Crossref  
Faculty of Law, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, 30139, Indonesia. Tel./Fax:  
+62-711 580063 | E-mail: [sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id](mailto:sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id) Homepage:  
<http://journal.fh.unsri.ac.id/index.php/sriwijayalawreview/index>

---

**3 attachments**

 **SLREV MASTER ASSESSMENT FORM (4) - Copy.pdf**  
138K

 **Template Febrian.doc**  
205K

 **Master Tabel response to reviewer comments.docx**  
270K

## Reviewer Assessment Form

**Title:**

No		Comments	Suggestion
1	<b>Title</b>	Good	
2	<b>Abstract</b>	It is not clear what the problem is and cannot be clearly and concretely read about what are the most important results/findings of this research? This should be depicted in the abstract	Abstracts need to be reformulated in order to describe or photograph the problems reviewed, and the results of the analysis.
3	<b>Introduction</b>	<p>- Not focused and too broad by reviewing the issues of the MPR, DPR and DPD institutions as well as the parliamentary system. What is being discussed is the DPRD secretariat</p> <p>- There are no legal problems yet, except for a statement that the position of the DPRD secretariat, which is located at two feet between the DPRD and the Regional Government, is allegedly going to make this institution not impartial. However, there is no explanation about:</p> <p>1. What is the legal basis that the DPRD secretariat should be independent and impartial? This is important to point out because if the rules do not require the secretariat to be impartial, then there is no demand for this institution to be impartial.</p> <p>2. The author mentions that the current position of the DPRD secretariat will cause a conflict of interest? In what position will this institution experience a conflict of interest, while its duties and authorities only support secretarial and administrative matters. The DPRD Secretariat does not have a political policy function. This needs to be elaborated.</p> <p>3. It is also unclear how the conflict of interest of the DPRD secretariat occurred in the Banyuasin context? The author is only hypothesizing, but does not provide concrete examples of the occurrence of conflicts of interest in practice in Banyuasin. It is necessary to state real facts if this exists so that it is not merely subjective.</p>	<p>- It is better to just focus on the DPRD Secretariat, there is no need to go around discussing parliament in general, including the bicameral and unicameral parliamentary systems.</p> <p>- It is necessary to present the background of several cases as samples to prove that there is indeed a problem with the performance of the DPRD secretariat in Banyuasin. Don't just make assumptions.</p>

4	<b>Problems</b>	The formulation of the first and second problems has no correlation. The formulation of the first problem questions the practice in Banyuasin, but the second problem wants to formulate policies on a national scale. How can local data be used nationally?	There needs to be a synchronization between the formulation of the problem
5	<b>Method (If Any)</b>	To test whether the current position of the Banyuasin DPRD secretariat creates a conflict of interest and is not impartial, normative research is not enough. Must be empirical research.	Need to be directed to empirical research
6	<b>Analysis</b>	In the discussion, no answers were found to the two main questions/problems to be discussed in this paper, namely:  1. Does the position of the DPRD secretariat as regulated in the legislation at the regional level in practice have an impact on conflicts of interest in the legislative and executive functions in the regions, especially in Banyuasin Regency, South Sumatra?  2. What solutions are needed to address these problems in the wider context of Indonesia?	The analysis needs to focus on the main problem so that it does not widen.  Also include the data because in the analysis there is no visible data. Just an assumption.
7	<b>Conclusion</b>	Provide your analysis	Before formulating recommendations, conclusions from the analysis need to be described first so that it will be known whether the findings in the analysis are connected with the recommendations offered.
8	<b>Reference</b>	ok	
9	<b>Others</b>		

**CONCLUSION:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Accepted</b>	X	<b>Accepted with revision by author(s)</b>
--------------------------	-----------------	---	--



# SRIWIJAYA Law Review

ISSN Print: 2541-5298  
ISSN Online: 2541-6464

**Editorial Office:** Faculty of Law, Universitas Sriwijaya, Jalan Srijaya Negara, Palembang, Indonesia.  
Phone: +62711-580063 Fax: +62711-581179  
E-mail: [sriwijalayalawreview@unsri.ac.id](mailto:sriwijalayalawreview@unsri.ac.id) | [sriwijalayalawreview@gmail.com](mailto:sriwijalayalawreview@gmail.com)  
Website: <http://journal.fh.unsri.ac.id/index.php/sriwijalayalawreview>

<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Accepted with revision by editorial board</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Rejected</b>
--------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------------



Sriwijaya Law Review &lt;sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id&gt;

---

**[SLRev] Editor Decision**

1 message

---

**Sriwijaya Law Review** <sriwijayalawreview@fh.unsri.ac.id>  
Reply-To: Nurhidayatuloh - <nurhidayatuloh@fh.unsri.ac.id>  
To: Febrian Febrian <febrian\_zen@yahoo.com.sg>  
Cc: sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id

30 July 2022 at 12:31

Dear  
Febrian Febrian,

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Sriwijaya Law Review, "SINERGITAS SEKRETARIS DPRD TERHADAP FUNGSI LEGISLARIF DAN EKSEKUTIF".

Our decision is: Revisions Required  
Warm Regards,

Nurhidayatuloh  
(SCOPUS ID: 57211560728)  
Managing Editor & Regional Handling Editor for Asia Pacific  
Sriwijaya Law Review Indexed by:  
SCOPUS; SINTA; ASEAN Citation Index; EBSCO; Google Scholar; DOAJ; Indonesian  
Scientific Journal Database | Member of Crossref  
Faculty of Law, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, 30139, Indonesia. Tel./Fax:  
+62-711 580063 | E-mail: [sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id](mailto:sriwijayalawreview@unsri.ac.id) Homepage:  
<http://journal.fh.unsri.ac.id/index.php/sriwijayalawreview/index>



**Hasil-Review-1869-5570-2-RV.doc**  
205K

## Response to Reviewer's Comments

### 1. Response to the First reviewer's comments

No	Reviewer's Comments	Page	Author Responses
1	<p>it is not clear what the problem is and cannot be clearly and concretely read about what are the most important results/findings of this research? This should be depicted in the abstract</p> <p>Abstracts need to be reformulated in order to describe or photograph the problems reviewed, and the results of the analysis</p>	<b>Abstract</b>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out. We have revised the abstract in order to provide a clear explanation of the problems. As a result of the analysis, we found that DPRD Secretariat institutional system violates the higher regulations.</p>
2	<p>- Not focused and too broad by reviewing the issues of the MPR, DPR and DPD institutions as well as the parliamentary system. What is being discussed is the DPRD secretariat</p> <p>- There are no legal problems yet, except for a statement that the position of the DPRD secretariat, which is located two feet between the DPRD and the Regional Government, is allegedly going to make this institution not impartial. However, there is no explanation about:</p> <p>1. What is the legal basis that the DPRD secretariat should be independent and</p>	<b>Introduction</b>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. It would have been interesting to just focus discussing on DPRD Secretariat. However, it is better if we add some explanation about Indonesia parliamentary system. Based on the Law no 17 of 2014, Indonesia Parliamentary System is bicameral in which People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) is consisted of House of Representatives (DPR) and the Regional Representatives Council (DPD). However, the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) is ruled under the Regional Government Law (the Law No 23 of 2014)</p>





<p>impartial? This is important to point out because if the rules do not require the secretariat to be impartial, then there is no demand for this institution to be impartial.</p> <p>2. The author mentions that the current position of the DPRD secretariat will cause a conflict of interest? In what position will this institution experience a conflict of interest, while its duties and authorities only support secretarial and administrative matters. The DPRD Secretariat does not have a political policy function. This needs to be elaborated.</p> <p>3. It is also unclear how the conflict of interest of the DPRD secretariat occurred in the Banyuasin context? The author is only hypothesizing, but does not provide concrete examples of the occurrence of conflicts of interest in practice in Banyuasin. It is necessary to state real facts if this exists so that it is not merely subjective.</p> <p>- It is better to just focus on the DPRD Secretariat, there is no need to go around discussing parliament in</p>		
--	--	--





	<p>general, including the bicameral and unicameral parliamentary systems.</p> <p>- It is necessary to present the background of several cases as samples to prove that there is indeed a problem with the performance of the secretariat in Banyuasin. Don't just make assumptions.</p>		
3	<p>The formulation of the first and second problems has no correlation. The formulation of the first problem questions the practice in Banyuasin, but the second problem wants to formulate policies on a national scale. How can local data be used nationally</p>	<b>Problems</b>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. However, the Banyuasin region case could be a lesson for other regions. Therefore, there is a need to formulate regulations (laws and policies) regarding with this issue.</p> <p>In addition, as per the reviewer's recommendation, the author has also added data from several other regions, namely: the Province of East Java, Central Java, South Sumatra, Buton District, Yogyakarta City and Cirebon District.</p>
4	<p>To test whether the current position of the Banyuasin DPRD secretariat creates a conflict of interest and is not impartial, normative research is not enough. Must be empirical research.</p>	<b>Method</b>	<p>We agree with this comment. An empirical research method has been added to this research.</p>



5	<p>In the discussion, no answers were found to the two main questions/problems to be discussed in this paper, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the position of the DPRD secretariat as regulated in the legislation at the regional level in practice have an impact on conflicts of interest in the legislative and executive functions in the regions, especially in Banyuasin Regency, South Sumatra?</li> <li>2. What solutions are needed to address these problems in the wider context of Indonesia?</li> </ol> <p>The analysis needs to focus on the main problem so that it does not widen. Also include the data because in the analysis there is no visible data. Just an assumption</p>	<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out. Therefore, we have revised as suggested and added some data.</p>
6.	<p>Provide your analysis</p>	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	<p>I agree with this comment. I have provided a deep analysis in this paper. In Addition, I also have completed the analysis which was adjusted with the additional data in several regions.</p>

## Response to the Second reviewer's comments

No	Reviewer's Comments	Page	Author Responses
1	It would be more appropriate if this title was adapted to the title in English	Title	I have changed the title as suggested.
2	As a legislature? DPRD within the framework of a unitary state is not a legislative body	Abstract	I agree with this. We have already made it clear explanation in this part.
3	It is necessary to mention specifically the laws and regulations because Indonesia also has an MPR, why is this body not also classified as a legislative body? If the MPR is a legislative body, then Indonesia applies a tricameral system	Introduction	I have added the law to this discussion.  I have also added the reasons why the MPR is not classified as a legislative body in the constitutional system in Indonesia
4	The two issues that are the focus of this research are actually related to empirical data to analyze whether there is an impact and analyze the solution. It is not sufficient to study normatively. It is necessary to strengthen the description of the data in the previous paragraph for conflicts of interest.	Introduction	I have revised and added the research method with the empirical method.  I have also added some empirical data regarding the practice of Regulating the Organizational Structure of the DPRD Secretariat in Indonesia.
5	It is necessary to add a case approach and at the same time combine it with empirical legal research.	Research Method	I have added a case approach to this paper.
6	With regard to the position of the DPRD Secretariat, in fact this paragraph answers the first problem, but this needs to be elaborated again so that a clear difference in the position of the DPRD Secretariat is determined	Analysis and Discussion	I have already provided some explanation about the differences between both DPRD Secretariat.



	based on regional regulations and regent regulations.		
7	legislative council? the mention of terms must be appropriate and consistent	Analysis and Discussion	I have revised this part
8	There are no answers and descriptions of the second problem studied regarding how the solutions needed to overcome the first problem in the broader context in Indonesia are found here. Need a description that focuses on the problem under study.	Analysis and Discussion	I have provided more deep analysis in this part.
9	The mention of legislative institutions is contrary to the provisions of Law no. 23/20014 that DPRD is an element of the regional administration. The mention of terms must be appropriate and consistent.	Analysis and Discussion	I have revised this part
10	Conclusions on the first formulation of the problem have not been listed here. It contains more answers to the second problem formulation, in the form of solutions offered by the author. The factors listed here have not been described in the discussion, but appear in the conclusion.	Conclusion	Thank you for pointing this out. I have revised the conclusion as suggested.
11	Add references from journal articles.	References	I have added more references from journals. You might check the references section.

