

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJL2C _127449
Title of the Manuscript:	Initial Consonant Mutation in Fulfulde: An Optimality Theoretic Account
Type of the Article	

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.	The study is relevant to the academic community in terms of its novelty and precision. It investigates the Sokoto dialect of Fulfulde which, hitherto, has not received much attention. The scope of the study which covers only initial consonant mutation in the dialect under investigation makes the contribution to existing empirical knowledge concise. I, therefore, laud the approach adopted for the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not quite Suggested title: Initial Consonant Mutation in Fulfulde: An Optimality Theory Account	
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 second and third sentences: Initial consonant mutation...responsible for this difference, looks more like findings. Rather bring in a line or two that make the work stand out from others, more like a background. How was the data collected? The study uncovers other constraints such as? Suggestion: the abstract needs to be rewritten for clarity and conciseness	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not quite: There should be sections for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theoretical framework - Review of Literature - Methodology - Findings 	
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 topic is current and contemporary. The data is well analysed, within the scope of the study, with well-selected examples. The tables also bring in more colour and clarity in data presentation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are not sufficient and most of those quoted in the work have not been added in the references. Out of the 11 works cited in the write up, only 5 have been put in the references. So, give full bibliographical entries for the following: Fisher, 2015; Girei (2009, p.18 Harrison, et al. 2012; Miyamoto, 1989 Seegerer, 2010 Wolfram (1991), The analysis and discussion, especially, should be supported with references from existing literature.	

Review Form 3

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable, but a second reading before the final submission is highly recommended.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Ngwa Colvis Niba
Department, University & Country	The University of Bertoua, Cameroon