

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJL2C_121116</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Constructions in Tamil and English- A Comparative Study with the existing Machine Translation systems</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The purpose of this study is unclear. The author/s say that their focus is to create <i>the mapping comparative constructions in Tamil with that of English and formulate rules for Machine Translation</i> and my question as a reader is: don't these rules of mapping already exist? Why does Bing Microsoft provide translations with a higher rate of accuracy compared to Google and Systran? In addition, the author/s say in the abstract that " <i>their results are discussed</i> " whereas in fact there is no discussion of the data collected in this study and no conclusions drawn from any discussion. The study would have been of interest if there was a discussion of the differences between machine translation versus human translation, limitations of machine translation and the identification of the reasons for the grammatical errors in MT.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. I would suggest as the title for the present study: A comparative study of the translation of comparative constructions provided by three machine translation systems from Tamil into English.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No. First, no references should be included in the abstract particularly of the type Dixon [3]. Second, in addition, to the methodology used in the study which is not clear at all, the abstract should briefly reflect the results obtained from it.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Methodology used in the study and the discussion of the data are missing.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is not scientifically correct. First, it is not clear what motivated the author/s to undertake this study, is there a gap in the literature regarding this topic? The literature review is not complete. In total, the author/s mention only three studies which discuss the grammatical structure of adjectives and adverbs in in English and Tamil and no other studies concerning the quality of translation provided by machine translations in any language including Tamil.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the number of references in this manuscript is insignificant (8). Apart from the Dixon and Rajendran other studies included in the reference list are not discussed anywhere in the text and are not related to the topic of the study.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is ok but there are sentences which need revising.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Gentjana Taraj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>'Aleksander Moisiu' University, Albania</b>