



REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Working in Unfamiliar Territory: A Rhetorical Criticism of the Work-Related Sequences in The Arrival by Shaun Tan"

Corresponding Author: Andrew Albritton

Email: andrewalbritton@missouristate.edu

Doi: 10.19044/llc.v8no1a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Wafaa A. Mostafa Hussein
Suez University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Published: 31.03.2021





LLC Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: LLC promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 22/1/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 25/1/2020
Manuscript Title: Working in Unfamiliar Territory: A Rhetorical Criticism of the Work-Related Sequences in <i>The Arrival</i> by Shaun Tan	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
------------------	--





1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	





Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:



International Journal of Linguistics,
Literature and Culture





LLC Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: LLC promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 22 January 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 25 January 2021
Manuscript Title: Working in Unfamiliar Territory: A Rhetorical Criticism of the Work-Related Sequences in <i>The Arrival</i> by Shaun Tan	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i>
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]





1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
The title is clear and it presents the content of the article.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
The abstract is thorough. It presents the objects, methods as well as the results of the study.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
The article's grammar is good. There is no typo or spelling mistake.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods of the study are explained clearly and adequately.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
The discussion (the artifact and the analysis) is clear and interesting.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
The conclusion has not accurately represented the discussion. It does not talk about the rhetorical criticism of the scenes in the book. Instead, the conclusion looks more like a suggestion of how to use the book for education.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
------------------------------	--





Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article is well-written and interesting to read. The only part that needs revision is the conclusion.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This article is good to be published once the conclusion is revised.

