

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_109500
Title of the Manuscript:	DESCRIPTION OF SOCIAL LIFE IN THE ANTHOLOGY OF HOAX POETRY POETRY: A Critical Analysis of the Work of Sosiawan Leak
Type of the Article	Review Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important since it critically deals with the impact of Hoax Poems that depict the harsh realities about political, economic and cultural aspects of common people.</p> <p>Suitable; however, 'Poetry' is repeated twice. One can be removed.</p> <p>Yes, quite comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, of course. All aspects of research methodology have been scrupulously followed.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Kata Kunci" should be replaced with 'Keywords' 2. Keywords section should avoid the expressions employed in the title and the abstract. It should not list personal names as well. 3. Introduction is too lengthy. Generic explanations about literature and poetry could be avoided. 4. It should be 'Results and Discussion.' 5. It should be 'Conclusions' since this section presents more than one conclusion. 6. Limitations of the study and the scope for further research should have been part of the concluding section. 7. <i>MLA Handbook</i> should have been followed for documentation purposes instead of the <i>APA Manual</i>. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeyaraj John Sekar
Department, University & Country	The American College, India