

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_99384
Title of the Manuscript:	The Troll: from Mythology and Folklore to Internet Trolling
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. Yes, as the manuscript explores the pros and cons of internet trolling and especially in this age of internet where the most of the population is under the influence of internet. Thus it is important for scientific community for more exploration and for common people too. 2. Yes, title is suitable. 3. Abstract is concise and clear. 4. Subsections and structure of manuscript is OK. 5. I, being a person of literature, can check the content and grammar. I cannot claim for scientific facts. 6. References are more than sufficient but more recent references might be quoted.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality might be refined and more sublime.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arvind Kumar Sharma
Department, University & Country	Ajay Kumar Garg Engineering College, Dr APJ Abdul Kalam University, India