



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_44267
Title of the Manuscript:	Public Policy Making in Coalition Government: Challenges and Solution
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	<p>INTRODUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author must contextualize this section to provide more information in the study topic. The introduction is short and that is why it has not addressed the topic being studied by the author. Coalition government is not coming out clear. Is it only parliament who does coalition? Political parties? The author must let it come out clearly. <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the author has demonstrated ability to organize the section, the author has not addressed the systematic review as a methodology. For example line 46/47. It doesn't make sense. Check line 80, "there was revealed relevance of 15 studies. These needs to be described to show what it addresses in the study: Modeling of coalition government (3) <input type="checkbox"/> Challenging ministerial discretion (4) <input type="checkbox"/> Delegation and agent issue (3) <input type="checkbox"/> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Again ensure you provide the year in which an author conducted a s study e.g. line 97 Martin (???), Meeting (????). Is this (K, 2016) a citation? How does for example, "diversity in interests and responsibilities" as found in the study. The author needs to reorganize this section to address the study. <input type="checkbox"/> Look at line 103/104, what does it say? The author needs to provide clear and address the topic under study. The author needs to provide clear sections on challenges arising from the listed coalition governments and subsequently give solutions in a systematic order. The author has presented in line 287 formulation of a coalition agreement or a contract <input type="checkbox"/> as a solution but there is nowhere in the coalition government where contractual agreements were breached. Maybe it is there but it needs to come out clearly <p>CONCLUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author should only provide conclusion instead of presenting findings again. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The author has the information but needs to reorganize and let it come out . The study needs more enrichment with the information on coalition government, specific challenges faced by specific/general coalitions, and then solutions should be related to the challenges stated.	

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:	Abraham Kisang
Department, University & Country	Kenyatta University, Kenya