

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJL2C_119278</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mapping the Linguistic Landscape of Old Bund of Ningbo through Translanguaging Theory</b>
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/editorial-policy> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Minor revision is recommended. However, the manuscript has its importance for scientific community and need for the recent period.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is fine.</p> <p>3. That is more than comprehensive. It should be concise (not more than 300 words).</p> <p>4. They are appropriate. However, there is a need to add some headings (see the comments in the reviewed manuscript).</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct, and the researcher made a good effort.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient but the style is not ok. For more detail, check the reviewed manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. As for as language is concerned, the proof reading is highly recommended. Language is not fine and even that is not the language of report writing.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Minor changings are recommended.</p>	

### PART 2:

	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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Imran Nazeer
Department, University & Country	University of Gujrat, Pakistan