

Editorial Comments:

I have read through the manuscript titled **The Impact of Religion and Spirituality on Literature: A Systematic Review (Ms_AJL2C_40925)**. I found the work a thought-provoking write-up worthy of publishing in this reputable journal. The manuscript a conceptual work (Library research) needs improvement before consideration for publication in the following aspects.

1. **Methodology**; the author must be explicit in explaining the methodology used in the manuscript and the rationale for choosing the methodology. As it stands now, the authors have to a great extent detailed the methods/techniques data gathering but no explanation on the methodology adopted.
2. **Critical review of literature** is not evidence in the manuscript. A conceptual write-up of philosophical nature like this requires a deeper review of materials in a dialectic manner. As such, presenting the reader with for and against argument will further enrich the manuscript.
3. A systemic review table should be included to show the flow of events in literature.

Author must do the necessary modifications as suggested herein as well as the reviewers.

Author Feedback:

1. I have added the required information regarding the employed methodology throughout the research; however, I believe the critics and editors of articles in your esteemed journal should understand the sensitivity of such subjects among the fanatic religious societies and the difficulties on the way to do the survey specially in some religious countries as most of these communities have got a very political view towards the scrutinized given topic and if the writer passes the red line that they have in their mind, it might lead to some negative consequences for the writer. They writers have already experienced living and feeling the unwritten rules of the surveyed communities.
2. The presented research has applied diverse methods approach combining in depth focus group discussions (based on topics discussed in the context of society and chamber of academic gatherings) without any questionnaire since the topic seems controversial and few participants showed interest to share their view towards the given topic (the added paragraphs are highlighted). Having conservative, fanatic, cautious, extremist, vague and irrational view and notion of the research participants towards the topic have limited the writer to reach to a determined and balanced census report and unique methods/techniques of data gathering.
3. I have already fit in 6 long paragraphs as the Critical Review of Literature. Since we are working on a complementary article with the same topic which is totally in line with the present article and is going to add more information, we preferred to save some reviews for the following articles. Besides, the length of an article should not exceed 10-12 pages that we have already expanded to the standard number of pages. I strongly believe that adding more review of literature and making it more critical is going to make the paper

boring and might be off the track which is considered beating around the bush by readers. I am confident that any additional part or paragraph will make the article wordy, off topic and distractive.

4. The given paper has been presented orally to a group of scholars and university students and based on the feedbacks that we have received so far, the flow of literary events has been arranged and easy to follow. I believe changing any part of the article is going to make the process of understanding a bit complicated and might lead to a vague and complex comprehension with hotch-potch information that may be tiring and not controversial to path the way of having a hot discussion in a group.