

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_102554
Title of the Manuscript:	Preserving African Heritage: The Role of Women in Ayi Kwei Armah's Fragments
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)
<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. This manuscript is important for scientific community due to its focus on African womens's role and heritage from the perspectives of depictions in a novel.</p> <p>2. The title of this article promotes duality. It is advised to emphasize more on one subject matter.</p> <p>3. The abstract is very repetitive and does not incorporate any credible scientific backings.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are considered to be biased, thus, promoting author's personal assumptions.</p> <p>5. This manuscript is highly speculative, thus, written in very subjective manner. Please consider revising.</p> <p>6. The references used in this article are outdated. Please consider using sources published in the last five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, the use of English language in this article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Bima Prana Chitra
Department, University & Country	Universitas Harapan Medan, Indonesia