

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_97601
Title of the Manuscript:	A Scientometric Mapping of Indonesian Myth Research
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The paper provides a comprehensive overview of previous research trends and themes related to Indonesian myth using scientometric analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The authors could provide more information about the selection criteria for the studies included in the analysis. • The authors may want to provide more context on why scientometric analysis was chosen as the method for this study. • The methodology section provides a clear explanation of the steps taken to carry out the analysis but could benefit from more details on keyword selection and cluster formation. • The paper observes a trend of increasing research on Indonesian myth in recent years, but more context or interpretation for the trend would be useful. • The conclusion could benefit from more exploration of the implications of the findings. • The paper would benefit from minor proofreading, grammar mistakes and editing to improve the clarity of the writing. <p>Overall, the paper provides a valuable overview of research on Indonesian myth and has the potential to make a significant contribution to the literature in this area.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, with minor improvement.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asimhussain Asim
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture, Pakistan