

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJL2C_84864</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Politeness in Arabic and Yoruba: Personal Pronouns as a Case Study</b>
Type of the Article	Original 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 Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

## Review Form 1.6

### 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	<p>The article contains a lot of grammar and sentences structure mistakes, punctuation mistakes ( the parts of the article is marked in pink);</p> <p>Some parts of the article contains sentences which illogical structure provoked questions, and the clarity of expressed ideas is dubious (the parts of the article is in yellow)</p> <p>The article lacks the explanation what the author means under the category of Politeness as pragmatic phenomenon. It is recommended to provide the overview of the theoretical works of famous scholars who deal with the problem of linguistic pragmatic category of politeness, for example Aijmer, K. (2011). <i>Contrastive pragmatics</i>. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co., Andersen, G., &amp; Aijmer, K. (2012). <i>Pragmatics of society</i>. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.</p> <p>It is advisable to enlarge the section of Methodology indicating the modern methodological approaches to the study of pragmatic aspect of communication, solely descriptive and comparative methods can be supplemented by semantic, contextual, discourse analysis, conversational analysis</p> <p>The article definitely lack the stated comparative aspects. It remains unexpressed explicitly how the application of appropriate formulas of politeness is realized in context of communication in both analysed languages. The author did not provide the substantiation of the decision to choose these very languages for comparison, how the appropriate or inappropriate application of grammatical forms of pronouns may influence the communication or cause misunderstanding, etc. How and in what way the appropriate forms of politeness can be substituted in translation from one discussed language to another.</p>	<p>Knowledge is a continuous process. Despite the manuscript had been given to someone for proofreading before sending to your journal, I still confirmed and agreed that some errors and mistakes still occurred therein.</p> <p>I hereby confirmed that I have done necessary corrections and the areas were highlighted. Some are deleted to remove ambiguity while some were replaced with different structures.</p> <p>Where necessary, further information was provided as required.</p> <p>In some cases, I found that ambiguity occurred because of punctuations. Amendments have been made to make the affected areas more understood.</p> <p>If accepted, new information in <i>blue ink</i> (Typological classification of both Arabic – Yoruba ad the Problem of Study) were added immediately after the INTRODUCTION. The aim is to upgrade the content. However if violate the culture of the journal, kindly delete.</p> <p>Results section has been added as requested by the editorial board</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper contains a great number of well known declarative statement which do not provide any new information or are scientifically relevant. It is unclear what academic field the article represent – whether it is comparative linguistics, pragmatics, translation theory and practice or didactics. The statements are not supported by empirical data selected by the methodology of sampling from the contexts of communication.</p> <p>Some paragraphs contain repetitions of one and the same ideas that create tautology or did not contribute to the development of scientific ideas (parts of the article marked in grey).</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The paper does not meet the requirements of academic style, is rather weak technically.</p>	

### 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?	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	