

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Arts &amp; Social Sciences</a> |
| 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> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Yes, the topic of the study is interesting from a social perspective as presents an research regarding Indonesian myth reported in previous studies, so that a bibliometric analysis was carried out. However, there are a number of inconsistencies that should be addressed.</b></li> <li>• <b>The title is adequate.</b></li> <li>• <b>The Abstract should be rewritten according to clarifications of the Results (as stated below).</b></li> <li>• <b>Subsections are adequate, but Discussion is merged with the Results, and there is no interpretation of the findings on the part of the authors.</b></li> <li>• <b>Yes, the scientific basis of the research is correct.</b></li> <li>• <b>References seem adequate.</b></li> </ul>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English needs to be improved and editing of the manuscript would be desirable.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The authors have to check consistency in the numbers. It appears that they have selected 73 documents, but in some tables (e.g. table 3) it is difficult to understand where the total numbers come from.</li> <li>• It is incorrect to cite "Archipel" as the dominant publication source (see table 3).</li> <li>• What is "data paper"?</li> <li>• Text in reference to figure 5, the meaning of "papers" should be clarified (e.g. articles ? ).</li> <li>• It is important to know how "cited documents at international level" have been calculated. This is a very critical point.</li> <li>• How research themes have been calculated? Based on key words assigned by the authors? Key words found in the documents? This point is very confusing.</li> <li>• Discussion is merged with the Results, and there is no interpretation of the findings on the part of the authors.</li> </ul> |   |

### 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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Marta Pulido</b>                   |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Barcelona, Spain</b> |