

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_106970
Title of the Manuscript:	TABI TABI PO: EXPLORATION OF PHILIPPINE LITERATURE A CORPUS-BASED STUDY
Type of the Article	Original research manuscript

### 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> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript is important for scientific community due to its concerns in both corpus and comparative study that furthermore explore the influential elements contributed to the shaping of Philippine literature.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is somewhat suitable. However, author is suggested to use a more direct title, such as "The Exploration of Philippine Literature <i>Tabi Tabi Po</i> in Corpus-Based Framework".</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, and can be thoroughly improved by mentioning the specific type of research method.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are appropriate, yet lacking in comparative phenomena analyses.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, author is advised to furthermore explain about the direct relationships between narratology and the texts comparison.</p> <p>6. Most of the references are outdated. Consider using sources published in the last five years.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The quality of English language used in this article is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	-	

### 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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bima Prana Chitra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Harapan Medan, Harapan University of Medan, Indonesia</b>