

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_111657
Title of the Manuscript:	How Distant Is 'Distant Reading'? A Paradigm Shift in Pedagogy
Type of the Article	Original Research 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript contains an important analysis of how distant reading can be done efficiently using digital humanities. The manuscript has also clearly listed the results of the analysis showing how close reading and distant reading complement each other. This study is important in improving the acquisition of knowledge by using technology that is constantly developing 2. The title is quite interesting. 3. The article is comprehensive but the first sentence is unnecessary. Too many keywords. Please choose maximum of 5 keywords from the abstract. Suggestion: close reading, distant reading, digital humanities, dimension and integration 4. Suggestion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Introduction (one page is enough) ii. Literature Review (definition and literature about close reading, distant reading, digital humanities and digital reading can be included in this section) iii. Methodology (objective, research question, research design) iv. Findings (Analysis for the answer to the research question) v. Discussion vi. Conclusion 5. According to the references provided, the manuscript should be scientifically correct. 6. Some references are too old (more than 15 years), but other references are still sufficient. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The content of the manuscript is good but some paragraphs contain bombastic words that may be difficult to understand. Use simpler words so the reader can digest them faster.</p>	

[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:	Naksa Binti Ahmad
Department, University & Country	Polytechnic of Ibrahim, Malaysia