

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_124208
Title of the Manuscript:	Materialistic Progress and the Decline of Indigenous Identity: A Postcolonial Critique of Orijit Sen's The River of Stories
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a nuanced critique of materialistic development and its adverse impact on indigenous identities through the lens of a graphic novel, a relatively underexplored medium in postcolonial studies. By examining Orijit Sen's "The River of Stories", the paper highlights the intersections of environmental degradation, cultural displacement, and neo-colonial ideologies, contributing valuable insights into ongoing debates about sustainable development and the preservation of indigenous cultures. I appreciate this manuscript for its interdisciplinary approach, combining postcolonial theory and eco-criticism to address a significant gap in existing literature, while also advocating for more inclusive and equitable development models. However, the manuscript could be strengthened with a deeper analysis of the visual elements of the graphic novel, which would enrich the argument and provide a more holistic critique of the narrative.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Materialistic Progress and the Decline of Indigenous Identity: A Postcolonial Critique of Orijit Sen's <i>The River of Stories</i>," is suitable as it clearly reflects the central themes of the manuscript—materialistic progress, the decline of indigenous identity, and the postcolonial critique of Sen's graphic novel. However, if you wish to make it more engaging and reflective of the manuscript's interdisciplinary approach, an alternative title could be: "Challenging Material Progress: Postcolonial and Eco-critical Perspectives on Indigenous Identity in Orijit Sen's <i>The River of Stories</i>" This alternative emphasizes the dual theoretical approach (postcolonial and eco-critical) and highlights the critique of material progress, making it more specific to the manuscript's scope.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive in its scope, effectively summarizing the key arguments and theoretical frameworks used in the analysis of Orijit Sen's <i>The River of Stories</i>. It highlights the impact of materialistic progress on indigenous identities and provides a clear indication of the postcolonial critique that underpins the study. However, to make the abstract more precise and engaging, here are some suggestions for improvement: Suggestions for Improvement: 1. Clarify the Contribution of Visual Elements: The abstract could briefly mention the importance of the visual elements in the graphic novel, as this is a distinctive aspect of Sen's work and a critical factor in how the narrative critiques development. 2. Expand on Theoretical Frameworks: Including a brief mention of the specific postcolonial and eco-critical perspectives applied would provide a clearer understanding of the theoretical approach. 3. Highlight Key Findings or Implications: The abstract should emphasize the main findings or implications of the study, particularly how the novel challenges dominant narratives of progress and what this means for contemporary debates on sustainable development. 4. Rephrase for Conciseness: Some sentences in the abstract can be tightened to improve readability and ensure that the key points are emphasized without redundancy.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous application of postcolonial and eco-critical theories, which are well-established frameworks in literary and cultural studies. It effectively utilizes key theoretical concepts from scholars like Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Antonio Gramsci to analyze Orijit Sen's <i>The River of Stories</i>, demonstrating a deep understanding of how these frameworks illuminate the novel's critique of materialistic progress and indigenous marginalization. The manuscript is grounded in a thorough literature review that situates the novel within relevant academic debates, and it provides detailed textual evidence and critical analysis that support its arguments. The integration of visual analysis further enhances the scientific correctness of the study, offering a multi-dimensional approach that aligns well with the interdisciplinary nature of</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>graphic novel studies.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references used in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, drawing from key scholars in postcolonial theory, eco-criticism, and graphic novel studies. The inclusion of foundational texts by Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak, and Antonio Gramsci provides a solid theoretical base. Additionally, references to recent studies, such as those published in 2021 and 2024, indicate that the manuscript engages with contemporary scholarship, which strengthens its relevance.</p> <p>However, there are areas where the manuscript could benefit from additional references to enhance its scholarly depth: Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eco-criticism and Indigenous Studies: Incorporating works by scholars like Rob Nixon, whose book <i>Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor</i> explores environmental degradation and its impact on marginalized communities, would strengthen the eco-critical perspective, especially concerning the slow, often unnoticed violence of development projects. 2. Graphic Novel and Visual Storytelling: Including more recent studies on graphic narratives, such as Hillary Chute's <i>Why Comics? From Underground to Everywhere</i> (2017), would provide additional insights into the significance of visual storytelling in representing marginalized voices and trauma. 3. Postcolonial Critiques of Development: Scholars like Arturo Escobar, particularly his work <i>Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World</i>, could provide a broader postcolonial critique of development, emphasizing how modern development models perpetuate colonial power dynamics. 4. Indigenous Representation in Literature: Adding references from scholars focusing on indigenous representation in literature, such as Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's works on indigenous resurgence and storytelling, could enhance the discussion on indigenous perspectives and resistance. 	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications, demonstrating a strong academic tone and appropriate use of discipline-specific terminology. The manuscript effectively articulates complex theoretical concepts and engages critically with the text of Orijit Sen's <i>The River of Stories</i>, maintaining a clear and coherent argument throughout. The vocabulary is precise, and the sentence structure is varied, which helps to keep the reader engaged with the content.</p> <p>However, there are a few areas where the language could be refined to enhance clarity and readability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sentence Structure: Some sentences are lengthy and complex, which may obscure key points. Breaking these into shorter, more direct sentences would improve readability without sacrificing academic rigor. 2. Repetition: The manuscript occasionally repeats certain ideas and phrases, which could be streamlined to make the writing more concise. Reducing redundancy will help sharpen the focus of each section. 3. Proofreading for Minor Errors: While the language is generally clear, a careful proofreading to catch minor grammatical errors, punctuation issues, and occasional awkward phrasing would further polish the manuscript. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a compelling and well-structured analysis of Orijit Sen's <i>The River of Stories</i>, highlighting the complex intersections of materialistic progress, indigenous identity, and postcolonial critique. Its interdisciplinary approach, combining postcolonial theory and eco-criticism, adds depth to the study and contributes valuable insights to the fields of literature, environmental studies, and cultural criticism. The paper is thorough in its use of primary and secondary sources, although a more detailed visual analysis of the graphic novel would further strengthen its arguments. The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, with minor adjustments needed for conciseness and readability. Overall, the manuscript is a significant contribution to discussions on sustainable development and the representation of marginalized communities in graphic literature.</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammad Rahmatullah
Department, University & Country	Northern University of Bangladesh, Bangladesh