

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_84388
Title of the Manuscript:	DISINTEGRATION CRIES ACROSS NIGERIA: SYMBOLS OF INSTITUTIONAL DEFECTS IN ANSWERING THE NATIONAL QUESTION
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	1. Abstract has inappropriate structure. I suggest answering the following aspects: - general context - novelty of the work - methodology used (describe briefly the main methods or treatments applied) - main results and related interpretations. 2. Introduction: This section should briefly place the study in a wide context and emphasize why it is relevant carrying out the analysis. It should define the purpose of the work and its significance. In this perspective, this section is too succinct and fails to effectively point out the relevance of your contribution towards the existing literature. Moreover, the authors do not provide at the end of the section the description of the paper structure which is very useful for readers. 3. Literature Review: This chapter is important. The authors present a rather modest system of analysis that can be further improved. It would be useful to analyze more and new sources. Only 36 sources are analyzed in the work. 4. The research methodology seems underdeveloped. Methods should be described in detail. I think the research procedure could be much more clearly described by means of a diagram also highlighting its potential and limit. The article is full of tables and figures, but I lack a more detailed explanation. 5. The isn't a discussion part. Authors should disclose their essential "discoveries".	Thanks for the remarks. <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The observations on abstract are now taken care of, and the suggestions are implemented.</li><li>2. The introductory part has been adjusted in line with your observations.</li><li>3. Observations on literature are equally appreciated.</li><li>4. Research methodology is now made clearer. However, this article does not contain tables and figures as you mentioned in your review Sir. I equally don't think the study needs description/ explanations with diagram.</li><li>5. Discovery is taken care of under conclusions/ recommendation.</li></ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

Review Form 1.6

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in the manuscript