Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences**
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)*
Compulsory 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".	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Dalia Perkumienė**
Department, University & Country	**Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania**