



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>)

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>The paper brings in new insights into the African politics literature. However, there is need for restructuring the paper. WTA should be defined earlier in the paper than wait until the "Theoretical framework".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the theoretical framework should be sent to the "Background of the study". - It will be worthwhile to see the history of WTA after the introduction than in the "conceptual framework". - The author should also make their methodology rigorous. How they operationalized their "Documentary analysis" should be clearly stated. While it is necessary to show the effectiveness of the suggested methodology, it is also very important to highlight how it has been used in the paper. In other words, the author should ask themselves how that methods directly yields the suggested methods. - Above all, the author should consider following a normal academic structure with a section on findings. That will show a connection between the methods and the results. 	<p>The origin of WTA has been sent to the background as indicated.</p> <p>The methodology has been rewritten and documentary analysis operationalized.</p>
Minor REVISION comment		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	