



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_88403
Title of the Manuscript:	Disruptive Concepts in Modern British Society: Immigration and Race and Racism.
Type of Article :	Short Research article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The author has revised the paper as requested.</p> <p>I have only minor suggestions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is to render the relation between race and racism explicit. Therefore, I would suggest the author to engage with the work of Alana Lentin, who wrote on this relation within a Western-European context. She defines race as a technology to manage human difference, while racism then indicates the discourse of implementing such technology in behaviour, policy, etc. <p>I think this nuance could help a reader grasp an important theoretical distinction while engaging with a critique on Modern British Society.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At times the piece makes bold statements. I am more a fan of situated critiques that are backed up by specific references. I advise the author to re-read the piece in its entirety and add references or reformulate general statements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “We have not already come to the end of these complex and somehow paradoxical words that modern society has decreed us. We are far from that historical relief.” → this is one of such big statements. Can you for instance situate this claim? Can you give a contemporary example of such paradox, so that the reader understands the angle of your article? ○ Your article is packed with ideas, which I do not mind, but without a solid angle it remains difficult to follow as a reader. It wouldn't be bad to formulate a clear question. This would make it easier for the reader to read all the concepts in relation to the central question addressed in the beginning of the paper. At the end of the paper, you can refer back to this question, integrating the most important insights in a concise conclusion. 	

PART 3: Objective Evaluation:



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Guideline	MARKS for this REVISED manuscript
<p>Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this REVISED manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0)</p> <p>Guideline: Accept (8-10) Revision required: (4-8) Rejected: (0-4)</p>	<p>The author had improved the quality of the article. For me it only lacks a solid research question at the beginning of the piece. Therefore, I give the manuscript a 7/10. I am confident that with a minor revision, the author will be able to make the necessary changes that would get this manuscript accepted.</p>