

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_110178
Title of the Manuscript:	THE WORLDVIEW OF A MODERN SCIENTIST: THE UNIVERSE CONCEPT IN THE CONTEXT OF CROSSCULTURAL COMMUNICATION
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, considering its originality and contribution to knowledge. As culture is relative, the paper provided insights and perspectives that show the relationship of the concept of "universe" to semiotic system of culture, rhetoric of actions and even human behavior in a specific cultural society.</p> <p>2. Here is an alternative title that would capture the context and the methods of the paper: The Cosmos in Conversation: Exploring the "Universe" in the Context of Crosscultural Scientific Discourse</p> <p>3. While the abstract is comprehensive, containing the framework, the objectives, methodology and conclusion, it should be written in a clear and orderly manner. Consider rewriting in a manner that is comprehensible to all.</p> <p>4. Results and discussions should be broken down into subtopics</p> <p>5. The manuscript seems to adhere to the scientific approach, hence, it is scientifically correct. It contains all the parts of a scientific paper, with the inclusion of a questionnaire providing empirical data, which adds a practical dimension to the study. However, consider rewriting the article or consult a language expert for writing or presenting a technical paper.</p> <p>6. While the references cover diverse disciplines and some classic works, references should be recent (publications for the past 10 years). The author might want to check and include related literatures on cultural semiotics which are published recently.</p> <p>7. Mention how did you process the results of the survey in the Materials and Methods.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	The language used in the manuscript should be clear, correct and unambiguous.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kristinne Joyce A. Lara</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Cagayan State University, Philippines</b>