

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJL2C_ 97652
Title of the Manuscript:	Diaspora African Women Writers and Postcolonial Thought: A Structural Comparison of Hope and Other Dangerous Pursuits and Americanah
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. Yes. Oke, but the abstract could include the elements/aspects being studied. Oke. Oke. No entries in References within the last 5 years (2019-2023)! - Please describe structural comparison and mention the elements/aspects to be compared. - It would be better if the manuscript first describes the two novels briefly before comparing them. - Please provide a table to recapitulate the results of the comparison. - Are there any significant differences between Hope (2005) and Americanah (2013) considering the period of publication?	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Oke.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ismail Petrus
Department, University & Country	Sriwijaya University, Indonesia