



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Challenges Toward Political Development
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript discusses an important and broad issue, but its main weakness is that it remains mostly descriptive. It explains common challenges to political development, but it does not yet present a clear argument, strong evidence, or a focused contribution.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The scope of the paper is too broad. It discusses all states, developing countries, corruption, institutions, inequality, participation, and instability, but it does not clearly set a specific context or case. This makes the discussion general and difficult to assess critically.
The methodology needs major clarification. The paper mentions qualitative, analytical, primary and secondary sources, and comparative analysis, but it does not explain what primary sources were used, which cases were compared, or how the analysis was actually done. Without this, the findings appear unsupported.
The research questions are too many and mostly descriptive. They ask basic questions such as the meaning of political development and its challenges, but they do not guide a deeper analysis. The paper should reduce and sharpen them so the study has a clearer direction.



The literature review needs more synthesis. At present, it mostly lists well-known authors and ideas, but it does not compare their arguments or show what gap the study is addressing. The author should explain how the existing literature leads to the present study.

Some sections move away from the main topic. The long discussion on economic development and social development is useful background, but it takes space from the central issue of political development. These parts should be shortened or clearly connected to the main argument.

The findings are too general and repeat points already stated earlier. Since the study claims to analyze challenges, the findings should show clearer results from the reviewed sources or cases, not only broad statements about institutions, corruption, and participation.

The conclusion needs to be more specific. It gives general solutions such as strong leadership, transparency, and citizen involvement, but it does not explain which reforms should be prioritized or how they directly respond to the problems discussed in the manuscript.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The topic chosen by the author is very interesting and always relevant. Exploring the barriers to political progress is a big and important task. The author tries to bring many concepts together.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Abstract and Introduction The abstract claims that the research analyzes real-world case studies. However, reading through the whole paper, there are zero actual case studies presented. The author must remove this claim from the abstract or, better yet, add actual country examples to support the arguments. In the Introduction section, the listed research questions are too basic. Asking questions like what is meant by political development belongs in a freshman class, not in a serious research paper. The questions need to be more analytical, focusing on the how and why of the structural challenges.
Literature Review The literature review brings in very good, classic scholars like Huntington, Fukuyama, and Lipset. This shows the author knows the foundational theories. But it is very outdated! The most recent source cited is from Fukuyama in 2014. The author really must include modern research from the last five to ten years to show what is happening in the field today.
Methodology



This section is painfully short and lacks rigor. The author simply states the research uses a qualitative and analytical methodology with secondary sources. This is not enough detail! The author needs to explain the exact criteria used for selecting these secondary sources. The text says it uses comparative analysis. But what systems are being compared? The author must explain the framework of this comparison clearly.

Structure and Off-Topic Content

There is a massive section dedicated to the classification of development, going deeply into Economic development and Social development. The author lists many aspects like employment generation, education, health, and cultural development. This is completely off-topic! The paper is titled Challenges Toward Political Development. All these long lists distract the reader and waste valuable space. The author should delete most of this and focus only on the political aspects. Under the heading Introduction to political development, the text immediately starts talking about the Concept of Political Instability. The heading and the text below it do not match well. The transitions are very weak.

Core Arguments and Findings

The sections explaining administrative and political corruption are well-written and explain the problems clearly. The explanation of how weak institutions lack autonomy and administrative capacity is also a strong point of the paper. However, the Findings section is very disappointing. It does not present any new discoveries. It just repeats what was already written in the introduction and the literature review, like saying corruption is a great obstacle. The author needs to synthesize the information to provide a new framework, a new model, or new specific recommendations rather than just summarizing the facts.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>1</u>	<u>Reviewer</u> <u>2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			