

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJL2C_111657</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>How Distant Is 'Distant Reading'? A Paradigm Shift in Pedagogy</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Doubtful and needs to be proofread by an expert. However, the ethnographic research idea is exciting because the approach used is multi-method. It is interesting to innovate research findings. Again, additional methodological clarification and validation are needed because the methodology used by the author still needs to be evident. The methodology offered is mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative), but as a research methodology, it does not clearly describe the steps of mixed-method research. For example, the existence of a mixed-method methodology needs to consistently describe the existence of 2 data (qualitative and quantitative) in this research. Furthermore, examples of data and how this data is analyzed have yet to be visible. The data analysis theory used by the author still needs to be visible.</p> <p>2. No, the title still does not describe an autobiographical study of the author, who has been teaching for 37 years. Another alternative title is the development of history argument as a model for the argumentative digital history : a case study of an English teacher</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and communicative but needs to be written based on a journal template published by an indexed international journal. It would be best to read examples of abstract writing published in the journal the writer want to resubmit to. It is essential to use as a reference. The abstract needs to be revised with a clear abstract structure (background, GAP, Novelty, contribution, data, data analysis using what theory, findings and discussion and Implications)</p> <p>4. The rhetorical structure of the manuscript written by the author is unique. Therefore, it needs to be proofread by an expert because it does not follow the standard style of writing manuscripts that use the structure of an indexed journal article</p> <p>5. Not yet. The author still over-cites the references he refers to, so the writer has yet to describe the writing with a nuance of synthesis regarding the references he/she reads.</p> <p>6. Yes, even though it is not perfect, it needs to be supplemented by reading articles that have been published, significantly articles written with autoethnographic studies. For example (1) Affordances of Plurilingual Instruction in Higher Education: A Mixed Methods Study with a Quasi-experiment in an English Language Program, (2) Arguing with Digital History: Patterns of Historical Interpretation, Or author can navigate the other article at the global database (<a href="https://academic.oup.com/journals">https://academic.oup.com/journals</a>) or another database ((2) <a href="https://www.cambridge.org/core/">https://www.cambridge.org/core/</a>, (3) <a href="https://www.emeraldinsight.com/">https://www.emeraldinsight.com/</a>, The author can use keywords from those topic that will be navigated and used as a reference.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>discuss the article to be submitted to an expert first for re-reading so that the systematic reconstruction of the manuscript can be revised in accordance with manuscript rules for international journals of adequate quality. Details of other comments can be read in the article I</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>attached.</p> <p>1..The choice of words and language structure is quite communicative but needs support from a more professional person (needs proofreading) for the final result of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript does not yet describe a manuscript written with an autobiographical research construction and mix method</li> <li>2. The abstract has yet to be written using the abstract writing structure. With describes GAPS, novelty, and methodology with existence of precise data so that the author display no visible digital data. Findings based on the results of data analysis still need to be visible, and the are no impact or implications of the research results</li> <li>3. The writing in the introductory chapter needs to describe preliminary studies (for example, in the last five years) on examples of previous research. The results of critical and evaluative reading have been obtained, for example, what has not been written by previous researchers, so that information can be made on things that need to be added and carried out so that autobiographical studies written with artifact data from digital sources can add to and enrich scientific research phenomena. Digital-based.</li> <li>4. The writing of the literature review section does not explain the digital-based autoethnography study using stand reading so that readers get pretty comprehensive information about the development of the original research on the topic of the manuscript being written.</li> <li>5. The methodology writing still needs to describe the existence of research data; there is no information on how to collect data from digital sources as a source of research data (research data sources from 37 years as an English teacher). Furthermore, there are no steps for data analysis, and data results or findings from data analysis activities (whose theory is used to analyze this data) are unavailable. Where the qualitative data is, the quantitative data still needs to be visible. Whose research design does the mixed method design use?</li> <li>6. The number of words in your manuscript is too many (more than 9 thousand; the ideal article is only around 6 thousand). First, read the style of argumentation in articles published by the Asia Journal of Language and Literature Culture study in the last five years, specifically on the topic of autobiographical research (with digital data).</li> <li>7. Thank you. The manuscript author can revise his article and resubmit this article so that it can be published successfully.</li> </ol>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bengkulu University, Indonesia</b>