

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_111898
Title of the Manuscript:	Review on the Book Entitled Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic
Type of the Article	Review of a book

Review Form 1.7

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 is so important that it can provide the scientific community with basic and essential ideas for solving the problem of ambiguity in Chinese language. It also focuses on the points of weaknesses and strengths in the previous studies preceding the publication of the book "<i>Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic</i>". 2. The suggested title is: Review on the Book of "<i>Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic</i>" 3. Yes, it is. 4. Yes, they are appropriate. 5. Yes, it is correct. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. <p>It is suggested that a subsection be added to clarify the difference between the traditional approaches used for disambiguation (three-domain theory and the atomic theory) and the recently introduced one by "<i>Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic</i>."</p>	
<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 language used in this manuscript is not suitable for scholarly communication, because of the poor style employed, the grammatical mistakes and the lack of accuracy when it comes to connect ideas and notions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The manuscript must pay attention to the logical connection between the paragraphs. - Some ideas and phrases are repeated more than once throughout the whole manuscript. - Sentences, like, "It can be said that without language, human society would collapse," in the first paragraph of the introduction, must be avoided because they are too general and have no scientific style. -The manuscript needs to be equipped with some more academic and scientific terminologies which make it rich and suitable for the scientific research. -The manuscript also needs more examples to show the difference between the traditional approaches used for disambiguation of the Chinese language (e.g., three-domain theory and the atomic theory) and the recently introduced method by "<i>Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic</i>." - The manuscript focuses on the previous studies neglecting the main topic of the study, "<i>Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic</i>," which must be given more explanation and further investigation. -A comparison must be made between the previous studies and that of the "<i>Syntactic Disambiguation of Modern Chinese with Experimental Prosodic</i>," to know how the latter has contributed to the development of Chinese disambiguation in human computer communication. - No reference has been made in section No.3 to the prosody of Chinese language. -The manuscript has employed longer key words, such as, "Disambiguation of Chinese language, Disambiguation with rhythm, Human-computer communication." 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>-No reference has been made to the importance of phonology in disambiguating the meaning in the Chinese language.</p> <p>-The conclusion is too general that it does not reflect the main concern of the manuscript. The manuscript focuses only on language as a tool of communication, neglecting the main topic which should be “disambiguating modern Chinese language with experimental rosodic.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	Aziz Khalaf Abid Saleh
Department, University & Country	University of Babylon, Iraq

Review Form 1.7