

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_101966
Title of the Manuscript:	The Chiasmic Gaze in Warsan Shire's poem, "Backwards"
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is important for scientific community, especially in terms of promoting critical thinking among readers and researchers alike. 2. Yes, the article's title is quite interesting; therefore, considered as suitable. 3. Unfortunately, the abstract section is not comprehensive due to the absence of theoretical and conceptual standpoints. 4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are not appropriately arranged, that seem to ignore the importance of both clear research methods and approaches. 5. In general, this manuscript is scientifically correct. However, is lacking in data evaluation. 6. The references are not recent nor sufficient. It is advisable to use scientific sources that are published in the last five years. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, the use of English in this manuscript is quite decent. Author might want to recheck for few grammatical errors and some uncommon terminologies. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author is advised to use only familiar English terms in the manuscript. 2. Please implement correct use of theories and approaches. 3. Please present some valid findings and avoid the act of jumping to conclusion. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

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