Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_64202**
Title of the Manuscript:	**DESERTION and LOVE in NOVEL GIZZARA (KUTUNGGU KAU DI TAPAL BATAS KULDEZEN) by FANNY J.PYOK**
Type of the Article	**Short 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI 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	**The body of the article has parts that show as state of the art deviating a little from the objective which is describing the problem of desertion and love in the novel.** **- The figure No. 1 doesn't have its source.** **- Some quotes are very antique. For example, Creswell 1994: 21 (in Minderop, 2019: 4). Look for quotations from 2015 to 2020, analysis of data for example is a topic is a highly researched subject, you will find latest citations.** **- The techniques, instruments and methods are adequate for the manuscript.** **- It is not appropriate to include the description of the characters in the discussion, I suggest that it be placed at the beginning of the manuscript. This allows the reader to know about the novel, do not leave it for the end.** **- The rest of the discussion is correct, well described and adapted to real life human's experiences. The comparison between the novel and reality is perfect.** **- The conclusion is very good, excellent redaction. It contrasts and compares the characters with the real world.** **- In general terms, the manuscript is well redacted. I think you can quit some irrelevant things to make the text shorter.** **- Please check the quotations that you put on the references, found some references that doesn't appear in the manuscript. All references should be have a citation.**	- - Figure 1 doesn't have source, because the author who made it. - Some antique quote has been fixed - Thank you for your suggestion, I agree with you to move the introduction of character by Fanny in the **Introduction** part - Quotation in the manuscript has the right references.
Minor REVISION comments	We advise a length of 3000-4000 words, perhaps the paper has 6277. The abstract is complete, clear and concisus. Showing methodology, results and conclusion suitable. Check the paragraphs because some of them do not have citations or cientific support. Check and Add.	Work in Progress. make it shorter for some sentences and paragraphs. But somehow, it's too risky to delete some sentences because it can be lost some context.
Optional/General comments	The manuscript has references to Web-resources or Electronic articles. The right way to quote it is: Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006;16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14. Perhaps the references to Web are new, but the references don't have the right organization or structure. Please check.	The manuscript has been revised.

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)*	