

Review Form 1.7

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

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. It highlights scientifically the linguistic landscape using trans language.</p> <p>Suitable.</p> <p>Subdivisions can be removed though is well-structured. It should be shorter with one sentence each on different aspects of the abstract. Particularly, results and conclusions should be made brief. Aim is not clear; it should directly spell out the reason for exploration of the feature.</p> <p>Yes. However, Consent and ethical approval sections can be reduced to one sentence avoiding the theory of the same.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Sufficient and up-to-date.</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>Good, slips can be avoided in the manuscript as pointed out in the abstract.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Keywords section should avoid the words already used in the title and the abstract. Documentation style should be consistent.</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:	Jeyaraj John Sekar
Department, University & Country	The American College, India