

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_93561
Title of the Manuscript:	Compound Words in Kisukuma
Type of the Article	Research 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 the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajl2c.com/index.php/AJL2C/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Has no prior research been conducted on Kisukuma compound words? If applicable, include relevant prior studies in the introduction and indicate the research gap and current state of the field. What are the data in this study? Data is not clearly explained. Only the data source. And there is no reference to the method used in this study. And reiterate on the conclusion.	1. About prior research the comment has resolved and included as commented 2. About data; the comment has resolved and indicated in the result and discussion section.
Minor REVISION comments	There are too many words in the abstract; please condense it (less than 250) Recommendations do not need to be described in the abstract; only the research's findings and Conclusion are required.	1. The comment has resolved and thus abstract is shortened. 2. About recommendation in the abstract the comment is resolved
Optional/General comments	Manuscripts are too long in the LITERATURE REVIEW section, should be reduced and added various related Menomena to the introduction only Give an introductory sentence before heading to the Result and Discussion sub-chapter	1. The comments in the literature review section remained unchanged to give clear understanding to the reader. 2. Comments on the result and discussion subchapter has resolved.

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	