

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_85824
Title of the Manuscript:	Stylistic Features of Chinese Translation of Emily Dickinson's Poetry: A Comparison of Kang Yanbin's and Wang Jinhua's translations
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.journalarjass.com/index.php/ARJASS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. English Language 2. Intent of translators 3. Comments on translation 4. Characteristic of Chinese vs English 5. Inferential statistics	1. The article should be edited for English- the author communicates well but many small errors of style remain. (I am assuming that the audience will be reading the article in English.) 2. Many translators speak clearly, in their introductions, about their translation plans and intentions. Their theory of translation. For example some aim to produce a literal translation and others a readable one. Was this the case here? The data seem to strongly support a different philosophy in the two translators. 3. Readers, reviewers, editors, and academics have almost certainly commented on the two translations. Some of these comments should be included in the paper. I imagine that they will echo some points raised by the author. 4. Are punctuation marks used in a similar manner in Chinese and English? Or are they a “special case” for translated materials. For example, if an exclamation mark is seldom employed in normal Chinese texts, then this might influence its use in the translations. 5. I would agree that inferential statistics are not necessary when one is discussing the number of words or stanzas. These are both large numbers. However, four-character structures, erhua wards, and Chinese function words are used less often and differences between translations may be due to amount of total text. With smaller n, a statistical test might be appropriate.	1. Yes, the author has polish the article language. 2. Yes, translator may sometimes, in Preface or Foreword,etc., introduces readers to the source author(poet) and his translation principle or intention which is very helpful for readers or researchers to understand his translation better. Yet, the two translators whom this article investigates do not say anything about their translation intention in the Preface, neither anywhere. It is understandable, for many translators, including the author of this article who is a translator for many years, prefer not to state their translation principle or intention. I have mentioned this fact in the revision of the article. 3. I have added a paragraph serving as a literature review to show that there is hardly any comment on the two translation which is insightful the study of this article. 4. I have added explanation in the revision to clarify that Chinese and English punctuation systems are similar, and so it does make sense to conduct comparison of punctuation. 5. For poetry translation, 1) equivalence of stanza quantity is important, for poetry is a literary genre which lays emphasis on form equally as on content. 2) As for words comparison between Chinese and English, yes, grammars of both languages are different, and so both utterances of English and Chinese to express the same meaning may be different not only in syntax but also in diction, however, a. it is undeniable that in any languages, when transmitting the same information, the more diction employed, the more prose-like, or un-poetic the expression will be, therefore, if there is obvious discrepancy in number of words in English original an its Chinese translation, this discrepancy do make sense, especially when based on big-data statistics. b. On the other hand, when compare two Chinese translations translated from the same source text, the distinctive difference in number of words used in the two Chinese translations will evidently speaks more.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Article could be abbreviated	1. The article seems a little repetitive and could be made shorter and more concise, but this is a matter of choice.	I will try to make language of the article more neat and concise
Optional/General comments 1. Appreciation 2. Recommendation	1. I found this article very interesting to read, and it introduce me to several new ideas. I congratulate the author (s). 2. I would recommend some revisions, in line with the compulsory points noted above.	Thanks very much.

Review Form 1.6

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