

# Review of: "Women's misogyny in modern culture, with a mythological allusion to Draupadi"

Suganya Anandakichenin

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The article needs more work to make it acceptable. Apart from the lack of structure and a proper argumentation, many other things are lacking. Here are a few things that need to be fixed by the author.

The author should be more thorough and give citations for any major point that is made. For example, she says "She is considered a feminist pioneer" - by whom? "Women's status has undoubtedly improved since ancient times, yet they are still seen as second-class citizens by the rest of society" - says who and where? And she should perhaps avoid stating her opinion as a fact: for example, "Draupadi was able to overcome her difficulties and persevere where other women would have given up." - how does she know? When she write "his epic is so huge and each character is so powerful, every great writer, thinker, and literature lover has written from the perspective of various Mahabharata characters", 'huge', 'powerful' and 'great' are subjective and to be avoided in general. And no, not *every* "great writer, thinker, and literature lover" has written from the perspective of various Mahabharata characters. The abstract does not mention Draupadi in Mahasweta Devi's story Draupadi, who is introduced in the introduction, and then apparently dropped.

While discussing Draupadi's disrobing, the author suddenly mentions something about polyandry with no proper transition, and immediately goes back to the disrobing episode. The paper needs to be more structured. The author ought to define and provide evidence for the concepts that she mentions: "When she emerges unhurt from the disrobing experience, it is because of her stri-shakti (womanly power)." What is stri-shakti? Develop. She quotes a whole paragraph by Pattanaik, but does not really comment or critically analyse it. What's the point then?

"Panchaali was continuously inundated with 'solutions' to make herself fairer and more appealing as a dark-skinned young girl. It is only through her early interactions with Krishna, who has a darker skin tone than her, that she realizes the power and magnetism that her dark-skinned beauty and identity as a woman give her" - where is this from??? How can a character from a centuries-old epic be compared with one produced by a modern-day writer without preparing the ground thoroughly beforehand?

Quotations such as Mah. 65:32 (without the reference to the parvan) or Spivak 1981 without the page reference are too vague.

And the English needs another round of editing and as well, and the typos need to be fixed as well.