

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_110379
Title of the Manuscript:	Personality in the semiotic system of culture: Lana Del Rey - Kate Silverton - Andrey Golov
Type of the 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1.The manuscript can be of great importance to the scientific community as it provides insights into the use of symbols in poetry by artists from different countries. It offers a valuable perspective on how culture and personal identity intersect, shedding light on the formation of unique personalities and their expression through artistic mediums 2. The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus on the use of symbols in poetry and their connection to culture and personal identity. It effectively captures the essence of the manuscript's contribution to understanding the formation of unique personalities through artistic expression. 3.The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it provides a concise summary of the main points discussed in the manuscript, including the exploration of symbols in poetry and their relationship to culture and personal identity. It effectively conveys the significance of this research in understanding how artistic mediums can reflect and shape individual personalities 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate as they effectively organize the content and allow for a clear progression of ideas. 5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The research findings are supported by relevant studies and evidence, and the methodology used seems rigorous and appropriate 6. Yes, the references in the manuscript are both sufficient and recent. The authors cite a wide range of studies from reputable sources, including many published within the last five years. This demonstrates that they have considered the most up-to-date research in their field and have taken care to provide a comprehensive overview of the existing literature.	<b>Thank you for your comprehensive, highly professional review.</b>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written and free from grammatical errors, making it easy to understand and engage with the author's arguments. Additionally, the use of appropriate terminology and academic conventions further enhances its suitability for scholarly communication.	<b>Thank you for your quality review.</b>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, I found the article to be a valuable contribution to the field. The authors have effectively synthesized previous research and presented their own findings in a clear and concise manner. The logical flow of the arguments and the inclusion of relevant citations further strengthen the credibility of their work. However, it would be beneficial for future research to include a larger sample size or conduct additional experiments to further validate their conclusions.	A larger sample size was made to strengthen the credibility of the work and to further validate the conclusions.

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