

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_128616
Title of the Manuscript:	Neologism and Semantic Shift among Politically-Created Terms during Pandemic: A Morpho-Semantic Analysis
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the intersection of linguistics and global crises by analysing politically-created neologisms and their semantic shifts during the pandemic. It highlights the dynamic evolution of language, highlighting how societal challenges foster linguistic creativity and adaptation. The study offers a comprehensive morpho-semantic framework that can serve as a reference for future research on language in crisis contexts; enriching the academic discourse on linguistics and socio-political communication. Its findings can benefit linguists, policymakers, and communicators in understanding the implications of new terminologies in public discourse.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title is informative but can be more concise and engaging. Alternatively, it could be "Linguistic Innovation during the Pandemic: Morpho-Semantic Analysis of Politically-Created Terms"</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is detailed and covers the study's objectives, methodology, findings, and significance. However, by reducing redundancy, it could be more focused. Following are some suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Clarify the unique contribution of the study in fewer words. □ Emphasise how the findings connect to broader linguistic and socio-political implications. □ Avoid repeating phrases like "politically-created terms during a pandemic" excessively. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust, employing well-established morpho-semantic frameworks and a qualitative discourse analysis methodology. The discussion aligns with current linguistic theories, and the examples provided are relevant and contextualised. However, additional clarity in linking the findings to specific societal impacts could enhance its scientific depth. Refer to the examples below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Discuss how politically-created terms like "flattening the curve" or "quarantine" influenced public understanding and compliance with health measures. For instance, the semantic shift in "quarantine" to mean a preventive measure rather than merely isolation may have shaped public perception and behaviour during the pandemic. □ Analyse how neologisms like "infodemic" highlighted the challenge of combating misinformation during the pandemic. The study could elaborate on how such terms facilitated global discussions about the reliability of information sources and the role of media literacy. □ Provide examples of how specific terms like "WFH" (Work from Home) or "zoombombing" were localised or adapted in different sociocultural contexts, reflecting variations in how different communities responded to pandemic-related challenges. □ Explore how some terms, such as "social distancing," might become permanent in the global lexicon, affecting how societies conceptualise proximity and social interactions beyond the pandemic. This links linguistic evolution to shifts in social norms and behaviours. □ Highlight how terms like "telehealth" or "WFH" reshaped communication in professional and educational settings, necessitating the adoption of new terminologies to describe virtual interactions and processes. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are extensive and include relevant studies. However, some sources (Hatch and Brown, 1995; Yule, 2010) are older. Including more recent research on neologisms and semantic changes in crisis contexts (post-2020) would strengthen the paper's currency. Refer to the suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Papers on COVID-19-related linguistic innovations (2021-2023). □ Studies exploring the sociolinguistic impact of global crises. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication, though there are minor grammatical inconsistencies and repetitive phrasing. Editing for conciseness and precision will enhance readability and impact.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The article tackles a timely and significant topic, analysing the impact of the pandemic on language, particularly through neologisms and semantic shifts in politically-created terms. □ It employs well-established morpho-semantic frameworks and a robust qualitative discourse analysis methodology. □ The discussion of word formation processes (acronyms, compounding, borrowing, and derivation) and the examples provided are comprehensive and relevant, demonstrating linguistic creativity during the pandemic. □ The manuscript highlights the dynamic and evolving nature of language, offering a valuable contribution to linguistic and socio-political studies. <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The manuscript could benefit from a stronger emphasis on the practical societal implications of the findings. For example, how do these linguistic changes influence public understanding, policy communication, or cultural adaptation during crises? □ Some sections, such as the abstract and introduction, are verbose and repetitive. Streamlining these parts would enhance readability and focus. □ The discussion of the results could be more critically reflective, exploring the broader implications of linguistic evolution beyond the pandemic context. □ The manuscript uses several older references. While they provide a foundational framework, including more recent studies on pandemic-related linguistic innovations would strengthen the relevance and currency of the research. <p>Language and Structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The language is generally clear and scholarly, but minor grammatical inconsistencies and redundant phrases should be addressed to improve conciseness. □ The structure of the manuscript is logical, with well-organised sections, but the conclusion could offer a stronger synthesis of the findings and their potential applications or future research directions. <p>Overall; this article offers a significant contribution to understanding linguistic creativity in times of crisis, making it relevant for scholars in linguistics, communication, and sociology. With minor revisions to enhance its clarity, conciseness, and critical depth, the manuscript will be suitable for publication.</p> <p>There do not appear to be any ethical issues in this manuscript. The study does not involve human or animal subjects and primarily focuses on the analysis of language and terminology, which is ethical within the scope of research norms.</p> <p>No competing interest issues are evident in this manuscript. The authors seem to have presented an unbiased linguistic analysis without personal, financial, or institutional conflicts of interest influencing the study.</p> <p>There are no indications of plagiarism in the sections reviewed.</p> <p>The manuscript demonstrates significant scholarly merit by addressing a relevant and innovative topic—the morpho- semantic analysis of politically-created terms during the pandemic. Its methodology and theoretical frameworks are well-selected, and the discussion is detailed and aligns with established linguistic theories.</p> <p>However, the manuscript requires minor revisions to address issues such as verbosity, a more explicit linkage of findings to societal impacts, and the inclusion of more recent references. These adjustments would enhance the clarity, conciseness, and overall impact of the paper. With these improvements, the manuscript would be highly suitable for publication.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Angela Rumina A/P Lourdesamy</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Management and Science University, Malaysia</p>