

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: **IJAR-58700**

**Title:** Elected by Whom? Ambedkar, Separate Electorates, and the Principle of Group Authorization

### Recommendation:

✓ Accept as it is ..... **YES**.....

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 159

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The document 'Elected by Whom? Ambedkar, Separate Electorates, and the Principle of Group Authorization' is unique topic.

**Recommendation :** Accept as it is.

### *Detailed Reviewer's Report*

- 1. Originality** – This paper, titled "Elected by Whom? Ambedkar, Separate Electorates, and the Principle of Group Authorization," re-examines Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's shifting stance on separate electorates versus joint electorates between 1919 and 1949.
- 2. Structure and Clarity** – The manuscript is generally well-structured with sections such as Introduction, Results, and Conclusion. However, transitions between sections can be improved, and paragraph alignment should be checked for consistency.
- 3. Strengths** – The author argues that scholars often mistake Ambedkar's commitment to a specific *device* (separate electorates) for a commitment to a core *principle* (group authorization).

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Ambedkar's fundamental priority was not separate electorates for their own sake, but ensuring that representatives of the Scheduled Castes were chosen by and held accountable to the Scheduled Castes themselves, rather than being installed by the caste-Hindu majority.

4. **Significance** – Ambedkar's acceptance of joint electorates in 1949 was neither a change of core principle nor a simple defeat; it was the adoption of a secondary mechanism to serve his enduring goal of genuine political representation under altered historical and electoral conditions.