



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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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><u>ABSTRACT</u></p> <p>Defining subject matter</p> <p>The abstract is an opportunity for the researcher to outline the problematic, the dialogue around it, discussion trends, gaps in the dialogue and what the world today wants to know about the subject matter as it relates to public policy making.</p> <p>In the introduction there is no definition of the subject matter. It is important that conceptual issues are addressed at the outset/early in the introduction so that we have convergence on core subject issues as the paper progresses.</p> <p>The definition must address the following; what is a coalition government, when/under what circumstances /why is it formed? when did it start appearing on the global/world scene? What are its potential benefits? And what are its potential problems?</p> <p>E.g What is a Coalition Government? A coalition government is a cabinet of a parliamentary government in which many or multiple political parties cooperate, reducing the dominance of any one party within that "coalition". The usual reason for this arrangement is that no party on its own can achieve a majority in the parliament.</p> <p>Another definition; coalition government, in a parliamentary government, body of advisors that is formed when different political parties choose to cooperate in the administration and regulation of a country or community. Coalition governments usually are a temporary alliance, being formed when no single political party gains a clear majority and competing parties instead negotiate to work together. Such a situation is likely to occur during a period of crisis, such as during a war, or in response to political breakdown. Members of all parties in a coalition government are appointed to a cabinet. (https://www.britannica.com/topic/coalition-government). There is need to give specific examples of coalition governments such as Kenya. In its very nature it is meant to be a transitional mechanism to address challenges identified.</p> <p>For an academic piece of this level it should come out clearly in the abstract how the researcher expects his work to add to the body of knowledge about coalition governments, or how the study benefits mankind. Are coalition governments a feature of all types of governments, for developed countries or for developing countries?</p> <p>Normally, a summary of conclusions relates study results or study outcomes to the problematic, or the study hypothesis stated</p>	



earlier on in the study. The study conclusions are stated as follows; *'The study concludes that the country with divergent and coalition government is recommended to formulate an agreement in the starting itself to reduce the future impact of divergent preference of political parties in policy formulation. Along with it, the presence of ideological differences on important issues like liberalisation, secularism, expectations of instability leads to the rise of minority coalitions which lead to difficulties in planning and implementation of policies'*. This lacks coherence in expression and clarity.

SECTION 1 : INTRODUCTION:

Leading discussants

An important subject like coalition subject has a contestation of ideas characterised by innovators of the dialogue, or subject matter, and the leading discussants that have emerged since its introduction. So we need to outline names of at least 4 or 5 leading authors or discussants on the subject of coalition governments, so that you don't give the impression Hazelhurst invented and still dominates the discussion on the subject. AS the bibliography clearly shows there are many contributors to the subject, so why are their contributions not acknowledged in the introduction? A literature scan should show that the researcher is well read around the issue and around leading contributors and trends in the dialogues. This has to be a significant part of the introduction.

SECTION 2 : METHODOLOGY

The section on Methodology fails to explicitly capture the issues under investigation, types of models and techniques of investigation,

Repetitions

The topic 'Methodology' is not presented clearly. A case in point is lack of clarity *'the methodology of the study is based on a systematic review of Government coalitions and challenges faced in policymaking'* Then there are repetitions, for instance *'A systematic review is a highly rigorous review of existing literature'* This is apparently an attempt to define review by using the same word 'review'. Repetitions flow into Section 2.1. As a result the whole paragraph lacks coherence and projection.

SECTION 3 DISCUSSION

A study conducted by Martin (year?) *'found out that policymakers in coalition governments have diversity in interests and responsibilities. And this is the major challenge faced by Government in policy making'*. A prognosis of this statement shows



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>that it really means nothing. Firstly, diversity of interests and responsibilities is a feature of everyday life. Then why should it become a special case Coalition Governments? Another study by Meeting (year?) (it is standard academic practice to indicate the years of publication/contribution. Why is this not being respected in some cases when it is also applied in others (eg Naoto, 2007, Bisla, 2016)?). These inconsistencies reduce the value of the research paper.</p> <p><u>SYSTEMATIC REVIEW CHART</u></p> <p>This is surely based on work by another author. Why is this not acknowledged?</p> <p><u>GENERAL OBSERVATIONS</u></p> <p>Sentences and statements lack coherence and clarity, and in many instances the English expression is very poor, such as incomplete sentences (eg 5th sentence in the abstract. It is preferable to use conventional approaches when formulating statements e.g. Current research instead of existing research</p> <p>It misleads the reading public and also misrepresents core issues of subject matter analysis and methodology</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Mungwari Teddy
Department, University & Country	Chinhoyi University of Technology, Zimbabwe