

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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) Yes. Extremely important</p> <p>2) Yes</p> <p>3) Yes, but I'd suggest changing the word "abstract" to "study" as the objective in the abstract should refer to the paper.</p> <p>4) I find the subsection Summary repetitive as the text is literally a copy from other parts. I suggest rewriting it or disregarding it as whole.</p> <p>5) There are no references along the paper, just in the end, in the subsection "References". The paper does not present any considerations about the study in terms of conclusions. It emphasizes only the actual study and its importance but does not explore what was found so far during the research. I understand that the objective of the paper is to present the upcoming research, but scientifically speaking when we choose to research about something, we already have some hypothesis, which are not explored. The conclusion section only focuses on complimenting the study and, as I mentioned, its relevance, but its actual importance should be recognized by peers, by professors and its reviewers. As researchers, our role is to elaborate the study and its papers in a way that it is thorough, scientifically and theoretically well-founded, methodologically correct, so that our peers can see how important our study is.</p> <p>6) There are some references cited in the correspondent subsection, but I cannot evaluate if they are sufficient as there are no references along the paper to sustain the arguments.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes. It is very well written.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	I find the study very important for scientific community, especially considering feminist studies and the significance of such works that value women in our society. However, I suggest exploring a little bit more about some previous conclusions and hypothesis, especially because there are so many objectives.	

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>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giselle Liana Fetter
Department, University & Country	Pontificia Universidade Catolica do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil