SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_49952
Title of the Manuscript:	Polygamy in Dramatic Texts: A Discussion around Postmodernism
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty</u>', 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	The abstract is very problematic. The paper clearly does not "interrogate". If it "take(s) precedence over other human social interactions", what do you call "cultural, religious and constitutional practice". Those are social interactions. Why identify polygamy as being in every continent if your focus is sub-Saharan Africa? This does not make sense to me. You state: "Polygamy is now at the centre stage of Western discourse for global acceptance.", but you don't prove it. In fact, you use sources to deny it. In fact, your conclusions are more accurate than your intro abstract. When you state: "In this work, we have isolated how religious, socio-cultural and trans-national practice of polygamous form of marriage is presented in four different Nigerian dramas.",	
Minor REVISION comments	that is in fact what you do. So, rewrite the abstract to focus on what you actually do.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alan Garfield
Department, University & Country	University of Dubuque, USA

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)