

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_116364
Title of the Manuscript:	A Multimodal Study on Discursive Strategies of Live Commerce Anchors
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is important for scientific community due to highlighting the diverse modalities used in China's news reports and TV talk shows as forms of discursive strategies.</li> <li>2. The title of this article is suitable. However, author is advised to focus more on specific area of study; thus changing the title to "Discursive Strategies in China's Live Commerce Anchors Multimodality".</li> <li>3. The abstract of this article is somewhat comprehensive. Nevertheless, theoretical and conceptual frameworks, as well as specific research method should always be clearly stated. Please consider revising.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriately made.</li> <li>5. The manuscript can be viewed as 'loosely scientific', due to the factors of mild subjectivity, some misspelled words, use of informal sentences, and observable inconsistencies.</li> <li>6. The references are not sufficient and recent. Consider using more reliable sources published in the last five years.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoid using informal expressions</li> <li>2. Avoid presenting highly debatable data and conclusions.</li> </ol>	

### 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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bima Prana Chitra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Harapan University of Medan, Indonesia</b>