

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_95878
Title of the Manuscript:	DIPLOMACY AMONG NATIONS: CASE STUDY MALAYSIA AND NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Policy 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. 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important to the scientific community because it explores how Nigeria and Malaysia that were colonized by Britain have advanced and progressed politically and economically post-independence. 2. DIPLOMACY AMONG NATIONS: THE CASE STUDY OF MALAYSIA AND NIGERIA (Title is modified to include: "the" and "of") 3. The abstract is good in detail, scope and focus - 4. The subsections are adequate. With respect to the structure, the manuscript is Well-constructed and has smooth flow of ideas. The paragraphs are well ordered or arranged and relate to the central arguments. 5. My finding shows that the manuscript is scientifically correct because it is based on logical rationale and bound by theory.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of research in this manuscript is simple and easy to understand. Thus, it is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	(Comment: The reference citations need uniformity given the fact that some start with last names while some others start with first names or initials.) After the recommended minor revisions/ corrections, I recommend that the manuscript should be officially published in the Journal.	

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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ngozi C. Kamalu
Department, University & Country	Fayetteville State University, USA