



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_45350
Title of the Manuscript:	The Origin and Effects of Winner-Takes-All Politics on Ghana's Drive to Democratic Consolidation.
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	<p>I want to appreciate the editor of tis journal for giving me an opportunity to review this work. I also want to apologise for my inability to review all the papers sent to me in the past it has to do with my schedule</p> <p>Having said that, my comments in respect of the current paper are hereby presented below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract lacks qualities of a good academic paper and it should be re written. For instance, methodology was omitted; as a review article there should be no findings. Where did your findings come from? Also, there should be nothing like conclusion but summary and concluding remarks. In addition to the above, recommendations should be deleted. Articles that engage primary source of data collection with hypotheses are expected to recommend based on the findings of the hypotheses. The question then is what are you recommending? 2. The introduction should be re written. Although an element of statement of the problem could be identified towards the end of the paper but the paper lacks organisation-the structure of the paper and objectives of the study were omitted. 3. The method of data collection for a study of this nature should have been historical thorough secondary source. 4. Effects of winner take it all should be re written. For instance, WTA politics leads to divisive campaigns that fail to address challenging issues but rather ignore the entire constituents. Should have been WTA politics could lead to.....since you do not have scientific facts to back your statement up. <p>Thank you and best of luck as you work hard to improve the quality of your paper</p>	<p>The abstract has been rewritten as recommended and the methodology has been included in the abstract.</p> <p>The introduction has been refined as indicated. The statement of the problem has been clearly stated in the introduction but not under a sub-heading reading "statement of the problem"</p> <p>That statement has been corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	