

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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none">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. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Article could be abbreviated | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The article seems a little repetitive and could be made shorter and more concise, but this is a matter of choice. | |
| Optional/General comments 1. Appreciation 2. Recommendation | <ol style="list-style-type: none">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. | |

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) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Name: | Cynthia Whissell |
| Department, University & Country | Laurentian University, Canada |