

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_89617
Title of the Manuscript:	TREATMENT OF MEN CHARACTERS TOWARDS WOMEN IN THE CANTERBURY TALES AND THE ARABIAN NIGHTS
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Thanks for inviting me to review this valuable paper entitled "Treatment of men characters towards women in the Canterbury Tales and the Arabian Nights." The paper of course contends some interesting issues subjecting twenty-one women characters revealed the descriptions of women. However, it needs some major refinement to attract a journal audience and adherences. The comments and possible suggestions for the author are written in a separate document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Language:</b> The language of the subject is hidden as well as research and scientific languages. The grammar is inadequate, and the entire manuscript requires serious editing.</li> <li>2. <b>Topic: appealing and acceptable.</b> I am confused. The paper seems like a literature review, but the author uses a qualitative study approach. If applicable, the author should insert the types of study (literature review) or study design.</li> <li>3. <b>Abstract.</b> The abstract doesn't adhere to the standardized format. It needs to start from defining the problem and the objective of the review or the study. Second, the methodology this manuscript used should be inserted. Third, the major findings have been put together, and finally, the implication of the review or the study should have to be included. The committee strongly advises the author to include these issues in the abstract. The author required major refinement.</li> <li>4. <b>Introduction.</b> Good, but it would make more sense if the author could incorporate the rationale for the study into the introduction. The introduction section does not have clear objectives. It should be included. Another major issue is text-in-citations. Of course, the author tried to show the issues effectively, but each statement lacks sources (citations). If available, they are outdated and unable to abide with journal style. For example, in the introduction section it says: The modern English translation done by Ronald L. Ecker and Eugene J. Crook of The Canterbury Tales by Geoffrey Chaucer is another translation used in this study. Our question is when it was published or translated. It should be put as... the modern English translation done by Ronald and Eugene (2016) of... And you should always use the last name when you cite some documents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some sources are also outdated. Of course, the manuscript needs to adhere to the books written decades ago, but you need to incorporate as much as possible from recent books. Those books were published within five years. For example... .....Daiches, 1987:24-25. Check for text-in citation issues thoroughly in your document.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. <b>Methodology.</b> I thought it was a review, which means you have used only secondary sources. However, in the manuscript, you have indicated that you used a qualitative approach. I think you should use qualitative as well as quantitative approaches when you have face-to-face contact with some individuals or samples. However, why did you choose a qualitative study design with textual analysis? You should integrate your rationale. Why did you choose only ten stories?</li> <li>6. <b>Results and discussions.</b> As a trend of the journal audience, I strongly recommend you separate the results</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	<p>and discussion sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This section, as my thorough assessment shows, is not written well. It needs major modifications. First, separate the discussion from the conclusion. This section was not well-supported by literature or predictions of theory, particularly the first and last paragraphs. This is because the study lacks a "literature review" or "theoretical framework" section.</li> </ul> <p>7. <b>Conclusion.</b> Because the author does not clearly interpret his or her data (findings), the conclusions are also ambiguous. The authors linked the stories to feminism ideas in the conclusion section. This diverse identity of women implies women's struggles for power even before radical feminists fought for them. How do you connect it?</p> <p>8. <b>References.</b> This section needs major refinement. Check the journal guidelines and published papers.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Habtamu Wondimu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wolkite University, Ethiopia</b>