



J. K. Press

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHSS_11799
Title of the Manuscript:	Womanism; A critical Search of Ethiopian Lore on Sex, Race and Class through Tsegaye Gebre Medhin's literary works
Type of the Article	Journal article



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript) 2. 3. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 4. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 5. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 6. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 7. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Thus manuscript discusses an interesting trajectory of women's studies by bringing in the analysis of Tsegaye's works. However, the theoretical discussion on feminism is rather reductionist & misguided. The conclusion that Tsegaye's ideas on womanism are much better (than feminism?) is also too simplistically done since feminism as a body of theory has managed to achieve numerous major changes in various areas throughout the world. The discussion needs to see the similarities or contributions that Tsegaye's works give to feminism rather than trying to champion which is a better idea because even 'womanism' is a feminist notion. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Yes 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes but does not follow abstract writing convention which should be in just one paragraph. The short discussion on feminism in the abstract is also misguided. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes but the discussion on feminist ideas, waves and trajectories must contain more nuances rather than simple conclusions. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? No. The discussion on feminism is too shallow and reductionist. However, the discussion of Tesgaye's works is 	



	<p>well-written.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>7. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>Insufficient and not recent. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is not too suitable for a journal publication. Requires language editing.	
Optional comments	-	

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:	Syazliyati Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia