

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_126215
Title of the Manuscript:	Arguments Against Federalism in Nepal: A Discussion on State Structure Reform
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>The manuscript titled "Arguments Against Federalism in Nepal: A Discussion on State Structure Reform" is well-organized and presents a critical analysis of federalism in Nepal through a thorough examination of the country's historical, social, and geographical complexities. This comprehensive discussion highlights the potential risks of federalism, such as ethnic fragmentation and the challenges to socio-economic stability, making a valuable contribution to the discourse on governance structures in ethnically diverse and geographically unique contexts like Nepal.</p> <p>However, to enhance readability and engagement, the manuscript could benefit from a more cohesive structure that clearly separates arguments against federalism into distinct subsections, summarizing key points at the end of each section for better flow. Other suggestions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Statement: Emphasize the controversial nature of federalism in Nepal, where it is contested along lines of ethnic, regional, and national unity concerns. • Research Purpose: Clearly state the study's goal to critically evaluate the opposition to federalism in Nepal and outline the implications of this debate on national cohesion. • Research Design: Briefly summarize the qualitative approach and the selection of secondary data sources. • Data Collection: Explain the systematic literature review and the inclusion criteria, emphasizing the focus on sources post-2007 to capture the latest political developments. • Data Analysis: Elaborate on the thematic analysis, including coding procedures and theme identification, highlighting the use of triangulation for data reliability. • Ethnic Fragmentation and National Unity: Describe the arguments suggesting that federalism could intensify ethnic divisions, with references to the views of parties like Rastriya Prajatantra Party (RPP) Nepal. • Socio-Economic Risks and Governance Challenges: Present findings on economic concerns, particularly regarding the financial sustainability of a federal system. Discuss the viewpoints of federalism opponents who argue that a unitary system with decentralization may be more effective. • Ambiguities in Indigenous and Tribal Classification: Discuss the contentious identification of indigenous groups, citing the lack of scientific evidence and the impact of this on structuring federalism along ethnic lines. • Party-Based Perspectives: Include key insights from party manifestos and public speeches 	

Review Form 3

	<p>that highlight varying stances on federalism, addressing why some parties propose alternatives like regional decentralization within a unitary structure.</p> <p>Conclusion: The conclusion could be strengthened by explicitly suggesting potential future research directions, such as examining case studies from other federal systems or exploring specific strategies to mitigate the risks highlighted. Additionally, emphasizing the broader applicability of these findings to other countries with diverse ethnic and political landscapes could underscore the study's relevance. Other suggestions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implications for Policy and Governance: Reflect on the potential impacts of these arguments on Nepal's political discourse, emphasizing the need for policies that balance local autonomy with national integrity. • Future Research Recommendations: Suggest areas for further research, such as historical and cultural studies to provide a clearer basis for ethnic federalism or other forms of regional restructuring. <p>References Provide a complete, properly formatted list of all sources used, including academic articles, party manifestos, and public speeches. Ensure consistency with the chosen citation style.</p> <p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores an under-researched area by providing insights into the dynamics of federalism in a country undergoing unique political and social transitions. By examining Nepal's specific challenges, it contributes to comparative federalism studies and deepens understanding of governance adaptation in ethnically and geographically complex societies. I find the manuscript valuable for its in-depth analysis and the relevance of its findings for policymakers and researchers in political science and federal studies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable.</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 is comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, but 3.4 – 3.9 need more articulation.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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>Under methodology, the word “multiple sources” should be explained in detail.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Being a systematic literature review paper, the references are insufficient.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language is suitable.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Peter Babajide Oloba</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Johannesburg, South Africa</p>