

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	Review 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>Yes, it is important as it deals with trolls and their uses in mythology....</p> <p>Suggested title: Exploration of Trolls in Mythology, Folklore and Internet Trolling</p> <p>It needs to be rewritten by adding comments as given by the reviewer.</p> <p>No, it lacks the literature review and the methodology sections.</p> <p>To some extent.</p> <p>References are sufficient, but they lack uniformity. The author needs to check the reference style and correct them according to the reference style as suggested by this journal.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Language is average. Some sentences are too long and unclear. The author needs to correct them as suggested by the reviewer.</p>	
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:	Lok Raj Sharma
Department, University & Country	Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Nepal

Review Form 1.7