

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)	1. No, it is not ingenious and creative enough for literary studies. 2. Yes, it can be suitable. 3. No it's not comprehensive. It should be the summary of the article with main points but it is not. (Also, the keywords you mentioned were not in the body of abstract) 4. No, introduction is not comprehensive, the goals and questions of study are not included. The body structures of the article are too short and without enough elaborate points. 5. No it is not. The structure is not like a scientific article. 6. The references should comprise of more than just four or five references. For writing a literary or scientific article you must include a wide variety of resources.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is too simple. It is not literary and critical.	
Optional/General comments	If I were you, I would try to read and provide more resources in order to have a detailed, inventive content which could be more interesting for readers. My suggestions: Provide more references, and read more articles to learn about structure of a literary article.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Zahra Zandiyeh
Department, University & Country	Tehran University of Art, Iran