

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-54393

Title: Reclaiming the Sacred: The Mythic Imagination in Amitav Ghosh's *Gun Island*

Recommendation:

Accept after major revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Zainuddin,

Date: 18/10/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication

The manuscript presents a thoughtful analysis of Amitav Ghosh's *Gun Island* through the lens of mythic imagination and ecological awareness. The idea of reclaiming the sacred within the Anthropocene context is both original and relevant to current literary and environmental studies. However, originality would be more convincing if the author engages with recent global scholarship (2020–2024) on myth, ecocriticism, and migration literature.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

A. Abstract and Keywords

Comment:

The abstract outlines the topic but remains too descriptive. It lacks explicit mention of research objectives, methodology, findings, and scholarly contribution

Recommendations:

- Clearly state the **aim of the research**.
- Indicate the **methodology** used (qualitative literary analysis combining myth criticism and ecocriticism).
- Summarize the **key findings and implications**.
- Limit keywords to five and align them with both theoretical and thematic content

B. Introduction

Comment:

The introduction presents the novel's background and its relevance but fails to establish a clear *research gap* or *academic urgency*. It does not explain why this study is necessary or how it differs from prior research on Ghosh or mythological narratives.

Recommendations:

- Define the **research gap** and justify the need for this study.
- Include **recent literature (2020–2024)** related to *Gun Island* and ecocritical myth studies.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- End the section with clear **research questions or objectives**.

C. Theoretical Framework

Comment:

The theoretical discussion relies mainly on classical myth scholars (Campbell, Eliade), but lacks contemporary perspectives relevant to postcolonial ecocriticism and environmental thought.

Recommendations:

- Discuss the intersections between myth, ecological ethics, and cultural memory.
- Position the study within current theoretical debates bridging *mythology* and *environmental humanities*.

D. Methodology

Comment:

The paper lacks a clearly defined methodology section.

Recommendations:

Include a short and explicit Methodology section specifying:

- Research type: qualitative and interpretive.
- Approach: literary analysis using myth criticism and postcolonial ecocritical frameworks.
- Data sources: primary (Ghosh's *Gun Island*); secondary (peer-reviewed articles and theoretical works).
- Analytical steps: textual reading, symbolic interpretation, thematic categorization.

E. Analysis and Discussion

Comment:

The discussion is informative but overly narrative. Much of it summarizes the novel rather than analyzing it through theoretical perspectives.

Recommendations:

- Restructure the analysis under thematic subheadings such as:
 1. *Myth as Ecological Consciousness*
 2. *Migration and Exile as Modern Mythic Journeys*
 3. *The Sacred and the Anthropocene*
- Integrate theoretical references within textual analysis (e.g., "This corresponds to Buell's (2021) concept of environmental imagination").
- Avoid plot retelling; focus on interpretive and symbolic dimensions.

F. Conclusion

Comment:

The conclusion effectively reiterates the main ideas but lacks explicit discussion of scholarly contribution and implications.

Recommendations:

- Highlight the study's **contribution to literary and ecological theory**.
- Add **theoretical implications** and **future research directions**.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Use a reflective tone rather than a mere summary.

G. References

Comment:

The reference list is insufficient (only three classic sources) and lacks APA formatting consistency.

Recommendations:

- Expand to 15–20 references, emphasizing recent scholarship (2015–2024).
- Maintain APA 7th Edition style with DOI links.
- Ensure a balance: 70% journal articles, 30% books.