

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_104338
Title of the Manuscript:	Research on the International Publicity Translation of Culture-loaded Words in the Corpus Involving Documentary and Tourism Propaganda Texts from the Perspective of Cultural Translation Theory
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. It is not only important but also has contemporary relevance. Cultural Translation theory is aptly employed.</p> <p>It is a bit lengthy. It can be shortened. The title should be partly revealing and partly concealing. It can be, for example, "Cultural Translation Theory Analysis of Documentary and Tourism Propaganda Texts"</p> <p>Yes, it can include the words that are not accommodated in the title.</p> <p>Well-structured, but each subsection must be introduced in a sentence or two.</p> <p>Yes, it is. It is well-substantiated with references and textual illustrations.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Since actual research starts only from Section 4 on page 11, earlier sections on the background of the study, review of literature and the theoretical framework can be proportionally shortened. As such, it is not only lengthy, but also clumsy and loose. 2. Conclusion part should be reduced to one paragraph. 3. Recommendations or Suggestions can be added. 4. Limitations of the Study should have been included. 5. Scope for further study in this area should have been pointed out. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the concluding part, the researcher should state to what extent he could address the two research questions mentioned in the text. 2. Slips are pointed out in red and alternative expressions are highlighted in yellow. 3. Keywords should exclude the words and phrases already used in the title and the abstract. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeyaraj John Sekar
Department, University & Country	The American College, India