

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_95873
Title of the Manuscript:	Storytelling of Religious Meaning on Tourist Attraction Sunan Kalijaga's Heirlooms Washing Phenomenological Perspective
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>1. The manuscript is important as it brings in the limelight some interesting Indonesian traditions and the author proposes several ways of promoting these traditions in order to preserve them and to attract more tourists. It also presents the rituals and explains the meanings of Sunan Kalijaga's heirloom washing tradition and how more tourists could be convinced to (re)visit this tourist destination.</p> <p>2. The title should be slightly changed in order to be more coherent. Suggested alternatives are: "Storytelling and the Religious Meaning of Sunan Kalijaga's Heirloom Washing Tourist Attraction. A Phenomenological Perspective" "Storytelling of the Religious Meaning of Sunan Kalijaga's Heirloom Washing Tourist Attraction. A Phenomenological Perspective"</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and in line with the contents of the manuscript.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript and its subsections are adequate.</p> <p>5. In the reviewer's opinion, the manuscript is based on some recent research and literature in the field. One question arises: The author mentions the names of some persons (R. Wahyu Sugiantoro and R.Ay. Hermin) that he/she interviewed for the purpose of his/ her research. Has the author obtained the interviewees' agreement to mention their names in the paper? If yes, this should also be mentioned in the paper. If no, the reviewer suggests that only the initials of these name be kept in the paper, in order to protect the interviewees' privacy.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent, there is no suggestion in this regard.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English used in the manuscript is quite poor, and the reviewer has performed a great deal of corrections marked with Track changes. The reviewer feels that further corrections/modifications should be made in order to increase the quality of the English language in this manuscript. There are two comments inserted in the manuscript by the reviewer that should be dealt with by the author or editor. However, the manuscript - as corrected by the reviewer – is comprehensible by the general reader, even without further corrections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is interesting and it raises awareness of the fact that traditions could represent valuable tourist attractions, contributing to a society's welfare. In the reviewer's opinion, the information from this article should be published.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The author mentions the names of some persons (R. Wahyu Sugiantoro and R.Ay. Hermin) that he/she interviewed for the purpose of his/ her research. Has the author obtained the interviewees' agreement to mention their names in the paper? If yes, this should also be mentioned in the paper. If no, the reviewer suggests that only the initials of these name be kept in the paper, in order to protect the interviewees' privacy.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alina Buzarna-Tihenea (Galbeaza)
Department, University & Country	Ovidius University of Constanta, Romania