Review of: "[Commentary] Commentary on Sociocultural Beliefs and Systems Restricting Women's Access to their Marital Property Rights in Pakistan"

Anicee Van Engeland[1]

1 Cranfield University

The abstract is well-written and clear: we understand clearly what the author seeks to do and how she will engage with the issue of marital property rights.

The exploration of the contradiction between constitutional aims and legislation and/or practice is indeed the outcome of cognitive dissonance, partially resulting from the influence of patriarchy. The main argument is therefore sound.

The article is submitted at an interesting time, as women in several Muslim countries are seeking to challenge patriarchal views on property (see Tunisia or Iraqi Kurdistan).

The approach is good but needs more theories. For example, when the author speaks of the opportunities lost in terms of development, they should not cite "Stand for her Land, 2019," but should instead engage with academic theory, including the work done on women and human security. By engaging with more academic theories and sources, the author will then strengthen their argument. It will lead the author to go further and beyond when explaining the stakes for Pakistani women. The need to go beyond is important for this piece to be truly original: indeed, the author should now link human security to the cognitive dissonance theory to demonstrate how patriarchy is a powerful motivator when bending constitutional aims. This leads us to the section on the parallel state of cognitive dissonance and consonance that will then flow better. At the time, that section doesn't flow naturally from the background section, and yet, it should flow.

While on the topic of footnotes, it would be great to see more Pakistani and other Asian voices cited in English but also in Urdu or other Pakistani languages. That said, the bibliography is impressive. Yet, I note references to articles that aren't exactly relevant, such as one on reproductive health in Nigeria or work on social cognitive theory in management.

The structure should be improved: right now, each paragraph almost appears as stand-alone. It requires a lot of effort from the reader to understand the argument in each paragraph but also to understand how each paragraph relates to one another. Another example is how a paragraph on programmers appears suddenly after Preston's graph. Why is it there? Which programmers are we talking about?

Preston's figure needs to be explained and applied to the case study: the author shouldn't let the reader do the work. I don't even know if I agree with the use of the model, as there is no explanation as to how it is applied.

Finally, the conclusion is hastened. The piece almost reads like a weblog entry rather than an academic piece. The issue of property rights and the gap between the constitution and practice is then forgotten…