



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-56201

Title: Personal Law in Comparative Perspective: Foundations, Variations, and Contemporary Challenges.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer Name: Abdul Hameed Shah

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

This manuscript provides a comprehensive doctrinal and comparative examination of personal law, addressing its historical evolution, pluralistic foundations, and contemporary challenges in the context of globalization, human rights, and constitutionalism. The topic is academically significant, particularly in plural societies such as India, Israel, Malaysia, and Nigeria, where tensions between religious autonomy and constitutional equality remain central legal debates.

The manuscript successfully integrates doctrinal, comparative, and socio-legal perspectives. The discussion of colonial codification, post-colonial continuities, and debates surrounding the Uniform Civil Code (UCC) in India adds contextual depth. The identification of research gaps—particularly concerning LGBTQ rights, digitalization, and transnational legal processes—is a notable strength.

However, substantial revision is required before publication:

1. Language and Academic Style

The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, typographical

REVIEWER'S REPORT

inconsistencies, and structural problems (e.g., incomplete sentences, repetition, spacing errors). Professional language editing is strongly recommended.

2. Abstract Refinement

The abstract is conceptually broad but lacks precision. It should clearly specify:

- Scope of jurisdictions examined
- Core argument or thesis
- Key findings
- Methodological contribution

3. Theoretical Framework

While the manuscript discusses pluralism and constitutionalism, it does not clearly articulate a central theoretical framework. Greater conceptual clarity is needed regarding:

- Legal pluralism theory
- Secular constitutionalism
- Conflict between group rights and individual rights

4. Comparative Depth

The comparative section is descriptive rather than analytically comparative. The paper would benefit from:

- Clear comparative criteria
- Structured comparison table or framework
- Deeper jurisdiction-specific analysis

5. Methodology Clarification

The methodology section is brief and general. It should clarify:

- Why specific jurisdictions were selected
- Limits of doctrinal vs socio-legal analysis
- Scope boundaries of the research

6. Citation and Referencing

Several scholars are mentioned without proper citation formatting. A standardized referencing style must be applied consistently throughout the manuscript.

7. Repetition and Redundancy

Some sections repeat similar content (e.g., literature review summary paragraphs). These should be consolidated to improve coherence and readability.

REVIEWER'S REPORT**8. Stronger Conclusion Needed**

A structured and analytically strong conclusion is required. It should:

- Directly answer the guiding research question
- Synthesize comparative findings
- Offer normative or reform-oriented recommendations

Overall Assessment

The manuscript addresses an important and enduring debate in comparative law: how personal law systems reconcile pluralism with constitutional equality and global human rights norms. The topic is timely and intellectually relevant. However, the paper currently reads more as an extended descriptive survey than a tightly argued comparative legal study. With substantial revision—particularly in language quality, analytical depth, and structural coherence—it has strong potential for publication.