

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_117070
Title of the Manuscript:	TRAVAILS OF COLLEGE TEACHERS HANDLING LANGUAGE RESEARCH COURSES IN THE NEW NORMAL SETTING: A PHENOMENOLOGY
Type of the Article	Research

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> <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>The article is well written, However the following are my observation and can be incorporated before finalisation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction is very narrow, the premise can be introduced better 2. Review of literature is very extensive, the division of studies as pre and post Covid-19 is appreciated, however the relevance is to be explained 3. Method section lacks important details like the time of conduction of the study can be specified 4. Validation of questionnaire is not specified 5. Demographic details of respondents is missing, the background would have relevance on the results 6. In the results, descriptive analysis and citing the responses from respondents is done well, however the percentage of responses/most common responses can be charted. 7. Discussion can be strengthened by comparing and contrasting the responses provided by respondents 8. Limitations of the study in terms of sample size can be cited. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhishek Budiguppe Panchakshari
Department, University & Country	All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, India