



Imron Rosidi <imronrosidi@gmail.com>

Fwd: 227724907 (Cogent Social Sciences) A revise decision has been made on your submission

1 message

Hasbullah Pawira <hasbullah@uin-suska.ac.id>

Tue, Jun 28, 2022 at 3:26 PM

To: imronrosidi@gmail.com

----- Forwarded message -----

Dari: **Cogent Social Sciences** <em@editorialmanager.com>

Date: Sel, 28 Jun 2022 14.50

Subject: 227724907 (Cogent Social Sciences) A revise decision has been made on your submission

To: Hasbullah Hasbullah <hasbullah@uin-suska.ac.id>

Ref: COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0633

227724907

Acceptance of the Existence of Salafi in the Development of Da'wah in Riau Malay Society, Indonesia
Cogent Social Sciences

Dear Hasbullah,

Your manuscript entitled "Acceptance of the Existence of Salafi in the Development of Da'wah in Riau Malay Society, Indonesia", which you submitted to Cogent Social Sciences, has now been reviewed.

The reviews, included at the bottom of the letter, indicate that your manuscript could be suitable for publication following revision. We hope that you will consider these suggestions, and revise your manuscript.

Please submit your revision by Jul 28, 2022, if you need additional time then please contact the Editorial Office.

To submit your revised manuscript please go to <https://rp.cogentoa.com/dashboard/> and log in. You will see an option to Revise alongside your submission record.

If you are unsure how to submit your revision, please contact us on OASS-peerreview@journals.tandf.co.uk

You also have the option of including the following with your revised submission:

* public interest statement - a description of your paper of NO MORE THAN 150 words suitable for a non-specialist reader, highlighting/explaining anything which will be of interest to the general public

* about the author - a short summary of NO MORE THAN 150 WORDS, detailing either your own or your group's key research activities, including a note on how the research reported in this paper relates to wider projects or issues.

* photo of the author(s), including details of who is in the photograph - please note that we can only publish one photo

If you require advice on language editing for your manuscript or assistance with arranging translation, please do consider using the Taylor & Francis Editing Services (www.tandfedittingservices.com).

Please ensure that you clearly highlight changes made to your manuscript, as well as submitting a thorough response to reviewers.

We look forward to receiving your revised article.

Best wishes,

Sandro Serpa, Ph.D.
Senior Editor
Cogent Social Sciences

Comments from the Editors and Reviewers:

Do you want to get recognition for this review on <https://publons.com/publisher/24/taylor-francis> target="_blank">Publons?</p><p><i> Don't let your reviewing work go unnoticed! Researchers the world over

use Publons to effortlessly track their valuable peer review contributions for any journal. If you opt in, your Publons profile will automatically be updated to show a verified record of this review in full compliance with the journal's review policy. If you don't have a Publons profile, you will be prompted to create a free account. [[Learn more](https://publons.com/publisher/24/taylor-francis)]

Reviewer 1: Yes

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Conclusions – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

References – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Writing – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation

Reviewer 1: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Comments to the author

Reviewer 1: Reviewer's notes and recommendations

Manuscript Number-COGENTSOCSCI-2022-0633, Title: "Acceptance of the Existence of Salafi in the Development of Da'wah in Riau Malay Society, Indonesia"

I would like to thank the editors (s) for including me as a reviewer for this scholarly work. This is a challenging academic opportunity, too. I could learn and obtained new information through the reviewing process of this article. Moreover, I want to give my evaluation of this article.

Firstly, as the majority Muslim country, discussing Islamic issue in Indonesia has been always important. This study offers essential findings based on a comprehensive field study (interviews and observations) in a specific area in Indonesia. Although the authors only focus on the single case study based on "the Riau region" in looking for the development Salafi movement, this article successfully provides a scientific contribution. The authors succeeded in establishing the research coherence presented in this article, especially between the method, literature review, findings and discussion.

Secondly, I still provide some corrections and inputs for the authors in completing the paper.

1. It is quite difficult (although it is not too serious issue) to read an article without page (pages).
2. Method: the authors presented the method section without reference. The authors also did not clarify the ethical consideration as insiders (part of Riau society and I suggest also as members of Islam, Muslim people). It is important to clarify this position in considering the objectivity of the study. The authors also should explain the justification for the chosen of informants (resource persons). Who are they? Why the authors consider them as informants! The authors also should present the limitation of the study (or the authors can add this in the conclusion section).
3. Table 1 without description. In the beginning, the authors note only two educational institutions in Riau, but in the table 1, the authors mention that there were 3 education institutions (schools). Please correct me if I am wrong!
4. Literature Review: Missing conceptual or theoretical foundations. The authors need to explain more about "public" (public acceptance). What do the authors mean about "public"? There is also a concept/theory of "public sphere". The authors can consider the concept/theory of (new) "religious movement" in understanding this issue.
5. Result.
 - First and second paragraph without reference to justify your argument. This is fundamental statement but

without reference from previous studies.

- The authors wrote the Result section just based on their field study (interviews and observations). I think it still needs relevant sources from previous studies.

- The part of "Riau Malays basis acceptance of the Salafis"

The first paragraph! The Malay open character? Can you elaborate more about this statement? This is important argument and finding but the authors still need to elaborate comprehensively not only based on the field study but also desk review (previous studies). I am surprised with too many arguments without justification from previous studies, scholarly works. There are too many claims. The authors also clarify the difference of the Malay culture and Islam based on the fact that mostly the Malays are the Muslim, too. So, the authors also should consider the division of the internal and external parts of society. Between the internal and the external factors.

6. Discussion

- The first paragraph, "In Malay culture, Islam is set to be the primary source of values, thus there should be no conflict of values contained in culture with Islamic values." This sentence confirms my question about the distinction between Islam dan the Malay culture. The authors should explain this issue comprehensively and make a clear justification.

- I am also surprised that the authors present this issue in "smooth way". Social scientist should also explore the dynamics and relationship concerning the issue.

7. Conclusion

- The authors should add this section with two information: first, the limitation of study and second, the social impact of the study.

Lastly, I recommend the authors revise this article based on some inputs. This article may also need proofread by native speakers.

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Sound

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Sound

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Sound

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Conclusions – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

References – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Writing – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation

Reviewer 2: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Comments to the author

Reviewer 2: - The article contains several typos and grammatical mistakes

- Transliterations are sometimes inconsistent and wrong, and it is unclear whether the transliteration is from Arabic or not, E.g., syar'i is not the transliteration of sharia from the Arabic. Or in another place, the author says thibbun nabawi, but this is not correct, as the initial letter is ط not ث.

- The author says that 15 informants were chosen. What was the criteria for their selection? And how has the author validated/verified that they are representative of the Pekanbaru City? Furthermore, are 15 informants enough to carve out an interpretation of an entire city? Unless these are considered, discussed, and mentioned, the weight of the paper rests on very sterile grounds. Furthermore, what were the ethical procedures that were carried out prior to conducting the interviews? This is not mentioned at all.

- Some would ascribe the salafi movement to Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahaab and some even Ibn Taymiyya. Others will disagree on the former (Wahaab) and might call him the originator of wahabi as opposed to salafi. How does the author understand the difference between salafi and wahabi? And how this tie in to the city being discussed. This remains unclear.
- The author mentions that the Malays are open to differences, but some strands of the salafi movement was an overt reaction to the very idea of the different madhabs. How does this square in with the Malaysian (Pekanbaru City) context?
- It is unclear to me how the author is dividing internal from external factors. What is this division predicated on?
- I am convinced that the author has an interesting question and study on their hands. However, I am not quite convinced that the data is robust, the interpretation is sound, and the conclusion follows in light of the previous comments, with some crucial questions and data that need to be discussed and are currently missing from the article. Most importantly, the author highlights that they can't generalise, but the the whole article is trying to understand the salafi impact in Pekanbaru City, which is a generalisation. So I do find the internal coherency of the paper to be weak. Given these points, I recommend the rejection of this paper, but a substantive revision and resubmission should be considered by the author and journal.

Do you want to get recognition for this review on [Publons](https://publons.com/publisher/24/taylor-francis)? Don't let your reviewing work go unnoticed! Researchers the world over use Publons to effortlessly track their valuable peer review contributions for any journal. If you opt in, your Publons profile will automatically be updated to show a verified record of this review in full compliance with the journal's review policy. If you don't have a Publons profile, you will be prompted to create a free account. [Learn more](https://publons.com/publisher/24/taylor-francis)

Reviewer 3: Yes

Title, Abstract and Introduction – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Methodology / Materials and Methods – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Objective / Hypothesis – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Sound

Figures and Tables – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Not applicable

Results / Data Analysis – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Interpretation / Discussion – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Conclusions – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

References – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Sound with minor or moderate revisions

Compliance with Ethical Standards – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Not applicable

Writing – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Unsound or fundamentally flawed

Supplemental Information and Data – overall evaluation

Reviewer 3: Not applicable

Comments to the author

Reviewer 3: The overall conception and analysis appear excellent and are deserving of eventual publication: such is not recommended at present. Because of the sensitive nature of the research, proper wording and clear understanding of the author's analysis is essential. Unfortunately, the writing is of such poor composition that multiple

readings and re-readings are necessary in order to properly grasp the author's intent. This problem presents throughout the article, in nearly every paragraph reviewed. The author needs to properly unpack, reword and rewrite the entire article, including abstract.

It would be interesting to see more attention spent on geospatial analysis: what are the physical relations of the actors involved and how do the dynamics of the social interactions engage with the environment? This is particularly called for, given the author's own designation of "inner" and "outer."

There are claims about the association of Malay to Islam that are not backed up by data from non-Islamic Malays. This is a fundamental problem; if such a claim cannot be backed up by the researcher, the claim should be either a) eliminated, or b) rephrased to refer only to Islamic Malays.

Given the author's own discussion at the top of the article, it would seem reasonable to expect some analysis of the gendered aspects of the phenomena discussed. However, the entire article appears entirely andro-centric in conception. The overall writing and analysis would benefit greatly from a reconsideration of the gendered dynamics involved.

There are numerous terms that fail to be defined by the author at any point in the article. This must be urgently addressed prior to publication.

Finally, the author must necessarily review and complete missing data in the reference section: article and chapter titles, for example, are at times missing journal names/book titles.

the manuscript needs thorough and rigorous improvement in order not to be rejected.

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. (Use the following URL: <https://www.editorialmanager.com/cogentsocsci/login.asp?a=r>). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.

2 attachments



Review.pdf
48K



Review Cogent.June 2022.docx
21K