



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>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.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>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.</p>	



[SDI 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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Everly Castellar Paternina
Department, University & Country	University Autonoma de Madrid, Spain