

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-52136**

Date: 06-06-2025

Title: Labor Jurisprudence Analysis: Strengthening the Human Resource Policy

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: Dr. P. Manochithra

Date: 06-06-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

This manuscript provides a timely and insightful analysis of Philippine Supreme Court labor jurisprudence and its implications for human resource (HR) policy. The study's integration of legal analysis with HR frameworks is a notable strength, offering practical, evidence-based guidance to foster fairness and resilience in organizational practices.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Title of the manuscript: *Labor Jurisprudence Analysis: Strengthening the Human Resource Policy*

Summary:

The manuscript presents a comprehensive qualitative analysis of 108 Philippine Supreme Court labor jurisprudence cases (2016–2020) to inform the development of human resource (HR) policies. Anchored in Paauwe's Contextually Based Human Resource Theory and aligned with UN SDG 8, the study employs thematic and content analysis methodologies. The findings contribute to a proposed ECJ (Evidence-Informed, Contextualized, Justice-Oriented) HR Policy Framework that can guide practitioners, policymakers, and labor advocates.

Strengths of the Manuscript

1. Topical Relevance and Significance:

The study addresses a critical intersection of labor law and HR management, offering insights highly relevant to both legal and HR audiences. In the post-pandemic landscape, jurisprudence-informed HR practices are urgently needed.

2. Robust Theoretical Anchoring:

The use of Paauwe's Contextually Based HR Theory provides a strong conceptual foundation, effectively framing the analysis within both HRM and legal studies.

3. Methodological Rigor:

The manuscript demonstrates a systematic approach through the use of Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis and Krippendorff's content analysis. The application of Cohen's Kappa for coding reliability adds further credibility.

4. Comprehensive Data Set:

The selection of 108 Supreme Court cases across various regions and industries ensures breadth and representativeness, enhancing the study's generalizability.

5. Actionable Outcomes:

The development of the ECJ HR Policy Framework is a practical contribution that bridges academic research with real-world HR application.

Weaknesses / Areas for Improvement

1. Theoretical Integration:

While Paauwe's framework is well presented, the discussion could be enhanced by deeper

REVIEWER'S REPORT

engagement with more recent HR scholarship, particularly regarding emerging trends in hybrid work, AI-driven management, and transnational labor contexts.

2. Depth of Legal Analysis:

The manuscript occasionally emphasizes procedural aspects of jurisprudence over deeper normative discussions about labor justice. Future revisions could strengthen the philosophical underpinnings of the analysis (e.g., exploring justice theory or ethical HRM more explicitly).

3. Clarity and Conciseness:

Certain sections (especially the results section) contain long and somewhat repetitive descriptions of case examples. Tightening the narrative and reducing redundancy would improve readability.

4. Visual Aids:

While figures (clouds, co-occurrence charts) are included, their explanations could be clearer for an interdisciplinary audience. Some readers may require more guidance to interpret these visuals effectively.

5. Discussion of Limitations:

The manuscript would benefit from a more explicit limitations section that discusses potential biases in case selection, the limitations of qualitative coding, and the jurisdictional scope (Philippine Supreme Court cases only).