

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_118707
Title of the Manuscript:	Unveiling Class Struggle: A Marxist Reading of Filipino Short Stories
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes. The subject matter is interesting and relevant. However, it will be clearer if the author has discussed why these Filipino short stories are discussed considering the themes identified. Some political or economic backgrounds about the country that necessitate the discussion of the themes will be very useful to provide context to the analysis. Is the title of the article suitable? Yes Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? To a certain extent. The structure and subsections are appropriate, but a more extensive discussion or explanation is desirable on why the Directed Content Analysis has been chosen instead of other approaches. There is no literature review section. The theoretical lens discussion is also rather brief. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Generally, yes. The analysis has been done rather clearly. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. References are relevant but there is a tendency for the author to include secondary in-text citations rather than citing directly from the source. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes, but a few language errors are noticeable so there is a need for proofreading.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A very focused article with a rather in-depth analysis. However, a literature review section and some discussion on the country's political and economic situations which link the analysis to the context will be desirable.</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:	Syazliyati Ibrahim
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi Mara, Malaysia