



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_46545
Title of the Manuscript:	Toward Addressing the Challenges Bedeviling the Strategies of Jama'atu Izalatil Bid'a Wa'iqamatis-Sunnah in the Democratization Process of Katsina State-Nigeria
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>)

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 manuscript is well written Nevertheless there are a series if unresolved issues. The author did not explained/conceptualised certain concepts such as democratisation, democracy, among others.</p> <p>The author was writing on Islamic civil society without providing sufficient background information about the group as well as its activities,</p> <p>How did the Izala contributed to democratisation in Katsina State? What were the modus operandi? What is the historical background of the group? What led to its split into two? What were the activities that led to the caution issued by the governor to the leaders of Izala?</p> <p>These issues and others ae necessary to be unpacked in order to out the theme of the paper in the right perspective.</p> <p>The manuscript required serious language editing. I tracked some part of the manuscript as attached but could not proceed because I discovered that there are lots of inconsistency in the use of language and a series of grammatical errors.</p>	<p>The issues are well addressed i.e. the concepts were conceptualized.</p> <p>The background of the group has been briefly provided</p> <p>The modus operandi and their contributions were also briefly included</p> <p>The activity was narrated a little bit in the introduction</p> <p>It was proofread and edited and the grammatical errors were resolved.</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) The observations made by the reviewer were genuine and concrete. They have further strengthened the quality of the paper.
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	