

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Journal of Social Studies and Economics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SAJSSSE_107540</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>WOMEN STRUGGLE FOR WORKERS' RIGHTS IN RADICAL AND MODERATE FEMINIST MEDIA</b>
Type of the Article	

**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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The purpose of the study was to take a look at how a message and theme are presented by two online feminist alternative media considered to have distinct styles (Radical and Moderate)</p> <p>The suggestions are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The study design could also be “descriptive survey” since the study seeks to find out the styles used to present their messages. (Konde.co and Magdalene.co) without describing the message as radical or moderate, telling these styles quantitatively alone, may be difficult to “show”. Perhaps, quantitative text analysis should be elaborated on why that is used and why descriptive survey is dropped.</li> <li>2 In the abstract, why the work is essential or important to be studied is not captured.</li> <li>3 In the introduction, “bot” is written instead of “both” in paragraph 5 line 10</li> <li>4 Let us consider a revision in paragraph 6 where “by” must be removed from in front of “heard”. Example: “media alternative makes women’s issues easier to be heard and disseminated...</li> <li>5 Reference “Tirto.id” lacks reference detail. Example: “Tirto.id, (2003)”</li> <li>6 More typographical errors must be revised. “their” in paragraph 6 line 9 has been spelt as “rheir”</li> <li>7 “period” instead of “periof” in the 2 line of the discussion on table 2.</li> <li>8 What about the results of a descriptive survey on the communication as data making part of the results and discussion? /methodology?</li> <li>9 Related literature review can be provided in addition to the theory (pragmatics).</li> <li>10 The connection of the theory with the dominant theme do not show clearly in the conclusion.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Georgina Brookman-Andoh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>St Louis College of Education, Ghana</b>