

## 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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The importance of the manuscript has been compromised by lack of problematization of the situation. The author(s) should have been explicit about the knowledge gap which the study endeavours to close</p> <p>The title could be more focused if it could read 'A Multimodal Study on the oftenness of Discursive Strategies of Live Commerce Anchors'</p> <p>The abstract should have mentioned the methodological issues of the study. The last key term should be expurgated since it does not feature in the abstract. It should be replaced by the term 'anchor'</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The means of generating data is scientifically correct.</p> <p>There is need for consistence in the presentation of the reference list. Some references have authors' full names but others have abbreviations of authors' first names.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>The English used is generally comprehensible. However there are few instances where meanings of some statements are compromised by length. For example, Like all other semiotic models, visual images meet the requirements to the relationship of representing the experience world, producers and recipients, interacting between participants and audiences represented in visual design, and arranging the composition of visual resources</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The last paragraph before 2. Multimodal Analysis of Videos needs rethinking. It is presented as a catalogue of aims. Have one aim from which some finer objectives are derived. The finer objectives should have been considered in the discussions – focusing on the extent to which they were achieved.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Davison Zireva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Morgenster College of Education, Zimbabwe</b>