

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNHST-018

Title: Negotiating Autonomy and State Regulation in Pesantren Management: A Case Study of Pesantren Baitul Arqom Polinggona

Recommendation:	Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Accept after minor revision	Originality		✓		
	Techn. Quality			✓	
	Clarity		✓		
	Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR- Lastri Wahyuni Manurung

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Abstract

- **Lines 6–12:**
The abstract is generally clear, but the phrase “*quantitizing qualitative data approach*” needs clarification. Briefly explain **how** this was done (e.g., frequency counting of themes).
- **Line 13–18:**
The findings are well summarized, but the sentence structure is too long. Consider breaking into shorter sentences for readability.

Introduction

- **Lines 31–32:**
Citation format is inconsistent: (*Trisnani, E. E., et.al, 2026*) → should be *et al.* (italicized and with proper punctuation).
- **Lines 35–36:**
(*Anwar, N.M, 2021*) → missing space after a comma and inconsistent initial format.
- **Lines 49–52:**
The sentence is too long and complex. Consider splitting into two sentences.
- **Lines 64–66:**
The sentence introducing previous research is awkward:

“as in the research conducted by Mustofa...”

Revise into a more academic form:

→ “*as demonstrated in the study by Mustofa et al. (2025)*”

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- **Lines 73–81:**
Overuse of “Then, research conducted by...”
→ Improve cohesion by using varied connectors (e.g., *Furthermore, Similarly, Another study by...*).
- **Lines 90–94:**
Good synthesis of previous studies, but lacks an **explicit research gap statement**. Strengthen by clearly stating:
→ “*However, previous studies have not...*”
- **Lines 117–118:**
Missing space:

“management practices.As a result” → should be *practices. As a result*

Research Method

- **Line 149:**
Citation (*Adji, T.P, 2024*) → formatting inconsistency.
- **Lines 160–162:**
The sampling technique is mentioned (purposive), but the **criteria for selecting informants are not clearly defined**. Please specify inclusion criteria.
- **Lines 163–166:**
“limited observation” is vague. Clarify:
→ What type? (non-participant? structured?)
- **Lines 175–183:**
The explanation of “quantifying qualitative data” is good but **methodologically weak**. Please clarify:
 - a. What unit of analysis was counted?
 - b. How were percentages calculated?
 - c. How reliability was ensured?

Results and Discussion**Results Section**

- **Lines 189–195:**
Percentages are clear, but the **sample size is very small (12 informants)**. Add justification for using percentages with small samples.
- **Tables (204–210, 253–257, etc.):**
Tables are informative, but:
 - a. Formatting is inconsistent
 - b. Titles should follow journal style (e.g., *Table 1. ...*)
 - c. Avoid repeating table data in full in the text