

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58701

Title: What Makes A Relationship Impossible?

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 Id: JPR-205

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

The manuscript presents an interesting comparative analysis of Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* and Ichiyo Higuchi's *Takekurabe*, particularly focusing on love, gender, social expectations, economic circumstances, and the societal factors that make relationships difficult or impossible. The comparative approach is relevant and offers an original perspective by bringing together two nineteenth-century literary works from different cultural and geographical contexts.

The manuscript demonstrates good engagement with the primary texts and provides several insightful observations regarding Anna and Vronsky, as well as Midori and Nobu. The discussion of gendered social expectations, women's limited agency, social stigma, economic dependence, and cultural restrictions contributes meaningfully to the overall argument. The attempt to interpret the two works through a New Historicist perspective is also appropriate and potentially valuable.

However, a few minor revisions are recommended before publication:

1. **The central argument should be stated more explicitly** in the introduction. The author should clearly identify the principal factors that make the relationships in the two texts impossible and explain how the comparison contributes to the existing literary discussion.
2. **The comparative discussion could be made more balanced.** Some sections focus extensively on *Anna Karenina*, while the corresponding discussion of *Takekurabe* is comparatively shorter. A slightly more systematic comparison would strengthen the manuscript.
3. **Some historical and biographical statements require additional supporting references.** In particular, claims concerning Tolstoy's relationship with Sofia Tolstaya, nineteenth-century Russian divorce practices, the Yoshiwara system, and Meiji-era Buddhism should be supported by appropriate scholarly sources.
4. **The author should exercise greater caution when connecting Tolstoy's personal views with his fictional characters.** The biographical material is relevant, but the distinction between the author's personal life, the narrator, and the views expressed by individual characters should be maintained.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

5. **The interpretation of Anna's suicide could be presented with slightly greater nuance.** The argument concerning patriarchal social structures is persuasive, but psychological, familial, and social factors may also be acknowledged to provide a more comprehensive interpretation.
6. **The discussion of the "Daikoku" reference and the paper narcissus is interesting and should be retained,** but the cultural and symbolic interpretations should be supported with appropriate academic references where possible.
7. **Citation and formatting require proofreading.** There are several inconsistencies in superscript numbering, spacing, quotation marks, page/chapter references, and special characters. These should be corrected before publication.
8. **The manuscript would benefit from a brief concluding section** that brings together the major findings from both texts and clearly states what the comparative study demonstrates about relationships, gender, and society.
9. **The title is informative but somewhat lengthy.** The author may consider shortening it while retaining the comparative focus of the study.
10. The manuscript should undergo a final **language and grammatical editing** to remove typographical errors and improve sentence flow and readability.

Overall Assessment

The manuscript is **original, relevant, and potentially significant** for comparative literary studies and gender-oriented literary criticism. Its central comparative idea is interesting, and the textual observations provide a useful basis for understanding how social and cultural structures influence intimate relationships.

The issues identified above are primarily matters of **clarification, documentation, organization, and language editing** and can be addressed without fundamentally altering the manuscript's central argument.

Final Recommendation

ACCEPT AFTER MINOR REVISION