

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_119099
Title of the Manuscript:	An Analysis of Volition and Self-identity Construction in Ai Qing's Poem
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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. This article is about Ai Qing's poetic creation from the two perspectives of form choice and poetic imagination process to explore Ai Qing's volition in poetry, as well as his self-identity construction during poem creation which is what keeps it different from the earlier studies undertaken by other researchers. Accordingly, I consider this article worthy of publication because it is well structured and has new point to share with the audience.</p> <p>2. The title is acceptable</p> <p>3. The abstract is ok but the author(s) is/are advised to add two more keyterms so as to abide by the rules for formulation of keyterms in information retrieval systems.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are appropriate</p> <p>5. Yes, it is.</p> <p>6. The references are relevant but a couple of recent sources are recommended to be added to make the references more updated. One source is 2020, two are 2019 and one is 2018. It is better to add a couple of sources that are recent (if available of course)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but minor revisions are required. I have mentioned them on the text of the article. Some words are not academic. Some spaces and punctuation marks, etc.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is a good article but minor revisions are needed. A couple of recent sources are needed to be added, and few terms need to be replaced or corrected as indicated in the text as comments. Since the points that need to be revised are minor and straightforward, if the revisions that the authors make are confirmed by the journal, it will not be necessary to send it to me again since two sources should be added to the text and minor revisions should be made in the verbatim as I have specified in the comments.</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:	Mohammad Reza Falahati Qadimi Fumani
Department, University & Country	Monitoring and Citation Institute, Iran