



Paper: “Women under Patriarchy: A Postcolonial Feminist Critique of Wole Soyinka’s The Lion and the Jewel”

Corresponding Author: Ramesh Prasad Adhikary

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n14p89

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ghulam Murtaza
Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Nouh Ibrahim Alguzo
Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University, Saudi Arabia

Published: 31.05.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr Ghulam Murtaza	
University/Country: Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan	
Date Manuscript Received: 9 May 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 10 May 2020
Manuscript Title: <i>Wole Soyinka's The Lion and the Jewel: Portrayal of Female Exploitation in the Post-colonial Nigeria</i>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---72.05.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<p style="text-align: center;">It may be rephrased as Women under Patriarchy: A Postcolonial Feminist Critique of <i>Wole Soyinka's The Lion and the Jewel</i></p>	

Or some way to make it better expressive.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	1
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Instead of the summary and characters and plot lines of the play, Introduction should give the socio-cultural and colonial / postcolonial context of the problem you are going to take up.

If the researcher gives a second and third reading, he will be able to improve it a lot.

The analysis should move systematically from point to point. It is haphazard. Preferably divide it into two or three important aspects which must be announced in delimitation.

Language needs thorough revision. A lot of grammatical errors.