

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>It provides additional body of knowledge to literature.</p> <p>It is suitable and striking.</p> <p>It is recommended that the author discusses his findings in a concise manner by providing insights on the stark realities of Indian masses vis-à-vis progressive literature.</p> <p>The author needs to discuss the aspects of the stark realities of Indian masses in relation to progressive literature to drive his point. This will enhance the quality of the manuscript and entice readers to read.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct provided the author will elaborate further on the identified themes of the study. It is substantial enough.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is highly recommended that the paper be edited by an English critic for appropriateness of language and style.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	John N. Cabansag
Department, University & Country	Apayao State College, Philippines