

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_72521
Title of the Manuscript:	Analytical Study of Sulaiman Layeq's Quatrain
Type of the Article	

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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment <u>To be remained as 'anonymous reviewer report'.</u>	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. There is a need to strengthen title of the article, following the conventions of research article which could include the "unit selling point" or novelty of the research, as well as the methods used on the samples, etc.</p> <p>2. Quoting from the Abstract, <i>Efforts have been made to clarify and explain important words of all four lines of the quatrain and their relation with each other.</i> I would suggest that the author elaborate the efforts comprehensively or coherently.</p> <p>3. I believe that the author is referring to the approach or the aim of the study when the word 'duty' was used in the Abstract.</p> <p>4. Quoting from the Abstract, <i>It is a library research which has employed descriptive and analytical methods. The finding of the article is that the poems of Sulaiman Layeq like other poets have different subjects in the area of meaning. This quatrain is related to human, human genuineness and humanism. The poet is very careful in choosing the subject, employing words for his own purpose, tones, rhythm and rhyme of the couplets, and number of syllables. The value of the research is that many of the author's poems particularly many of the quatrains, such as this one, need analysis and interpretation.</i> My opinion, the research method should further be elaborated with any triangulation approach, if any. In addition, the findings were quite vaguely discussed as it should have been more specifically described.</p> <p>5. In the Introduction, the aim and significance of the study should have been clearly stated. In addition, the "research or theoretical framework" is not clearly stated</p> <p>6. The methodology should have been vividly explained, with steps. If only the methodological framework could be attached, it would be clearer for readers to understand and perhaps emulate the research. The underpinning ideas of how the research was carried out should have been elaborated, rather than just 'conveniently' state that <i>"Although I have picked up very little information from books in this research, it can still be called a library research"</i>.</p> <p>7. In the Findings section, some vocabulary used by the author can be ambiguously represented. For example, does "all-sided simply means holistic? The subject the author is referring to is rather vague especially on how the analysis was done. The description of the analysis and interpretation should have been discussed in detail and the mode of analysis could have been highlighted.</p> <p>8. In the Discussion section, perhaps, the author can elaborate what this structure represented and why it could be very meaningful to the study (<i>According to moral structure, the discussion starts in the first line of the quatrain and ends in the last line.</i>)</p> <p>9. Some claims which could be substantiated with recent references, for example, <i>Every word is produced in the left side of the human brain and has a connection with the daily life of human being. Human unconsciousness is a collection of words, phrases and structures which appear in various times of present.</i></p> <p>10. Missing in-text citation detail as well as references could be found in the paper. (Shinwari, (0)); (Nasrat, (.));(Mutazilah; etc.)</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>11. Typos (extra commas) are found in some parts of the paper, not to mention some hanging sentences (<i>In the above quatrain.</i>). Author is advised to proofread the paper once again.</p> <p>12. In brief, the presentation of the findings should be done more systematically, according to certain thematic or controlling ideas. Using structured tables and figures could help a lot. The interpretation of the paper insights is qualitative in nature. It could have been strengthened if it is correlated with the 'known universe' of daily lives or other studies.</p> <p>13. Regarding the future research suggested, there was no clear indication as to what other researchers could do.</p> <p>In general, besides the underpinning theories and essence of the study, the manuscript is full of typographical errors or mistakes in references, in which effort of putting the concepts and writing conventions together is needed. The related references are quite limited. I would recommend more recent references to be added. In short, the data represent a good attempt to interpret patterns or even texts, which, however, is only valid if the study is explained more appropriately with the outcome. To understand this, the aspects mentioned above should be described in more detail. In other words, for the comprehensibility of the approach, a much more detailed description of the execution of the analysis is required, as well as a more structured data representation.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Nonetheless, this study is rather interesting and meaningful. If only the comments above could be incorporated, this research could generate meaningful insights for readers as well as once some major issues have been resolved. Resubmission is recommended once the exposition is polished.</p>	

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:	Ng Yu Jin
Department, University & Country	Universiti Tenaga Nasional, Malaysia