

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_121262
Title of the Manuscript:	The Quest for Abstract in John Steinbeck's The Pearl (1945)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	Yes, the manuscript is properly planned, delivers clear outputs, and is significant; hence, it is important for the scientific community. The manuscript "The Quest for Abstract in John Steinbeck's The Pearl (1945)" is important for the scientific community as it offers a fresh perspective on a classic literary work, providing new insights into its abstract themes. This type of analysis deepens our understanding of Steinbeck's narrative techniques and philosophical inquiries, contributing to the broader field of literary studies. I appreciate this manuscript because it combines rigorous textual analysis with thoughtful interpretation, revealing nuances that may be overlooked in more general readings. Such scholarship encourages further research and discussion, enriching the academic discourse around Steinbeck's works.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is appropriate.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and conveys the main themes of the study, but it does not yet include the techniques and methods used in this research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate	
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.	Yes, it is scientifically correct. The manuscript "The Quest for Abstract in John Steinbeck's The Pearl (1945)" is scientifically robust and technically sound because it presents a well-structured and thorough analysis of the abstract themes in Steinbeck's work. It effectively contextualizes Kino's discovery of the pearl within the broader historical and social framework of colonial domination, offering a nuanced interpretation of the protagonist's psychological and social journey. Additionally, the manuscript is grounded in established literary theories and methodologies, ensuring a rigorous and credible examination of the text. This approach not only enhances our understanding of the narrative but also provides a solid foundation for further scholarly exploration.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are not in accordance with the General Guidelines for Authors. Please adjust them to the reference writing style specified in the journal's guidelines. Add references of journals and books published 5-10 years ago, complete with DOIs. References from Wikipedia do not need to be listed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It suits enough.	
Optional/General comments	The discussion of this article has not provided a detailed data interpretation of the findings. The citations given do not support and strengthen the findings. Additional references are needed to support the researcher's interpretation.	

Review Form 3

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:	Selly Rahmawati
Department, University & Country	Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta, Indonesia