

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_104932
Title of the Manuscript:	The Appropriateness or Inappropriateness of the Multi-Party System in Burundian Politics
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:

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

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Review of the article "The Appropriateness or Inadequacy of the Multi-Party System in Burundian Politics"</p> <p>Given in the article, the author writes in the annotation that the article considers", based on the study and analysis of the fundamental documents of political parties, the problem is highlighted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article is devoted to an urgent problem and the author has conducted unique research in the field of the multi-party system in Burundi after independence, the advantages of the multi-party system and the disadvantages of the one-party system, indicating arguments and confirmations. According to the article, it is fashionable to learn a historical and legal analysis of how In the late 1950s Africa was subjected to a wave of claims to independence, including Burundi. It is in this context that indigenous elites have created political parties. 2. The author analyzed the political parties of Burundi before independence as attempts to establish democracy based on a multi-party system began before the declaration of independence of Burundi, which took place on July 1, 1962. The Burundian elites expressed early on their desire to achieve an ideal democracy so that they could be sovereign, but this could not be achieved without obstacles. 3. Conclusions about the practical and theoretical usefulness of the article ("detailed justifications are given", "explanations of the facts are given, as for example, in Burundi, the author writes, two attempts were made to create a political multiparty system: one before independence, and the other after independence in 1992. The one-party system has proved ineffective, and Burundi has now returned to a multi-party system. The majority of Burundians are now so in favor of a multi-party system that it is almost impossible to convince them. This research paper, which aimed to show whether a multi-party system is suitable for Burundi, proved that Burundians are proud of the arrival of a multi-party system in their country. The paper rightly notes that the transition from the one-party system that prevailed for quite a long time to a real multiparty system imposes a number of fundamentally new requirements and conditions on political parties that they must meet. 4. Throughout his research, it was obvious to the author that the overwhelming majority of Burundians do not support the one-party system where he cites it in tables, so I think that the article is deeply worked out and considered in detail. 5. Conclusion on the correctness of the design and compliance with methodological, industry and state standards, regulatory documents and recommendations when writing an article ("the article complies with the necessary design standards", "the author paid close attention to the correctness of writing and compliance with the data of higher-level documents"). 6. The conclusions formulated by the authors will contribute to the formation of a unified law enforcement practice in the field of the creation and activity of political parties, a clearer statement of goals, their implementation. 7. General conclusions and evaluation of the article ("the author accurately and timely considered the problem of how the multi-party system returned to Burundi after the speech of French President Francois Mitterrand on June 20, 1990 in La Baule, in which he called on African leaders to adopt political systems based on a plurality of parties, and after which many African countries gave their consent. Thus, today's political system of Burundi is based on a multitude of parties.", "the results of 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>the study obtained by the author allow for publication.</p> <p>8. The author made very logical conclusions based on the data obtained... for example, the main research tool used for data collection was an interview. Among all these respondents, 450 were men, while 150 were women. The results of this study showed that in Burundi, men prefer a multi-party system to a one-party system - 93.3%, while women support a one-party system - 100%.</p> <p>9. I recommend the article for publication in the publication</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukhitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna
Department, University & Country	Tashkent State Law University, Uzbekistan