



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_39607
Title of the Manuscript:	Reforming Electoral Practices for Democratic Consolidation in Ghana's Fourth Republic (1992-2016)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This is an interesting article, but thorough refinement is required before it will be suitable for publication	The authors have undertaken all necessary measures to do the needed corrections.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. English Language</p> <p>The article requires a thorough proof reading to correct the language. For example (P7-P10) it was hard to understand since there are 4 lines for one sentece without full stop. (P29-32)- 4 lines for one sentence. (P36-40)- same as above grammatical errors – for example (and these are only examples, there are many more) (P16) holding transparent and credible elections ‘are’ a critical rather than ‘is’.</p> <p>You also need to put in paragraph as for every point you made in P235-260. It was quite hard to read as no paragraph.</p> <p>2. Line of Argument</p> <p>Literature review is still need more attention. More analysis of LR are needed. You might summarize the study by combining similar data in one paragraph instead put each of study in one paragraph.</p> <p>It is not clear to what extent you are suggesting that EC reform will bring democratization in Ghana. Without such clarity, it is difficult to interpret your claim that ‘all these elections have had their own defining moments’.</p> <p>You should put your explanation by sub topic. It much easier to understand that.</p> <p>Your argument also unclear and you also not analyses your argument nicely.</p>	<p>1. English Language</p> <p>The necessary proof reading has been undertaken.</p> <p>P7-P10 have been split in two sentences. P29-32 have been split into two sentences. P36-40 have also been split into two sentences.</p> <p>P235-244 forms one paragraph. P245-260 also forms another paragraph. They are two different paragraphs. We would therefore be pleased if the reviewer could take a closer look at these paragraphs again.</p> <p>2. Line of Argument</p> <p>The authors focused on analysing the various electoral reforms in Ghana over the years by capturing such reforms under the various election years. For that reason “similar data” could not be put in “one paragraph”. For example, all necessary reforms that were undertaken prior to the 2008 elections are captured when discussing reforms for the 2008 elections.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, we have tried to put the explanation by “sub topic” as suggested. Thus, under the revised work, subheadings such as “The Role of Election and Electoral Reforms in Democratic Consolidation”, “The 1992 Elections: the Controversial Return to Constitutional Rule”, “Reforming for the 1996 and 2000 Elections”, etc. have been added to the Findings.</p>
Optional/General comments	This paper needs to go for English check. It is hard to understand the paper as it seems it was been translated from the local language to English. The author needs to put in the context for discussion after translate it to English.	As a matter of fact the work was originally written in English language which is the authors' official language.