

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 write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This research provides a significant contribution to the scientific community by examining the morpho-semantic features of politically-created terms during the pandemic, highlighting their linguistic innovation and semantic shifts. Also, it enriches the understanding of neologistic developments, affirms the dynamic nature of language, and encourages further exploration of semantic and contextual dimensions in evolving linguistic landscapes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I found the title appropriately fit to the stated research work.	
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.	The sources and medium of target data terms (where these terms have been used) would have added more clarity and understanding of readers.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The selected framework and methodology suited to the analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1994 till 2024 the recent and sufficient number of references have been cited by the author.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language employed in this article is appropriately tailored for scholarly communication, adhering to the standards of academic rigor and precision. It effectively conveys complex ideas with clarity and utilizes formal tone and structure, ensuring it meets the expectations of an academic audience.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, thill is an impressive and convincing research study.	

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:	Humaira Jamshed
Department, University & Country	Virtual University of Pakistan, Pakistan