

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_94973
Title of the Manuscript:	Premchand's Idea of Progressive Literature
Type of the 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> 	<p>The article appears to be a kind of repetition of the writer's views already expressed in his <i>Aim of Literature</i>. A critical assessment of the writer's idea of progressive literature cannot rest on two single shorty stories. An in-depth analysis of his entire collection of works can only do justice, instead of convenient selection.</p> <p>Yes Not comprehensive; it is only sketchy; it has just two sentences. The research tool, thesis statement, delimitations of the study, and limitations of the study are conspicuously missing.</p> <p>References to texts need further explanation in paragraphs 5 & 7 under "Empirical Literature." To some extent.</p> <p>References to Matthew Arnold, Trotsky, Gorky are required.</p> <p>The author is expected to explicitly state research questions (aim & objectives), working hypothesis, background of the study in the introduction to the study, limitations and scope for further research in the concluding section of the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Good, but slips shown can be avoided.	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeyaraj John Sekar
Department, University & Country	The American College, India