



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJL2C_41748
Title of the Manuscript:	The Country of Women: Third World Feminism in the Legends of Taiwanese Indigenous Peoples
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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>This study did arouse my great interest because it analysed the roles of country of women from three different literatures including Taiwanese indigenous legends, <i>Flowers in the Mirror</i> and <i>Herland</i>. The purpose of the research is not well connected with the title of the study. It didn't explain the definition of "Third World Feminism". Therefore, it is hard to understand the author's main purpose of this research. In addition, the subtitle in each section is not connected. For example, section III (lines 147-185) did not compare anything about the indigenous legends and <i>Flowers in the Mirror</i>. Same problem can be find in Section IV.</p> <p>The analyses of each literature are not appropriately done. The theoretical review of indigenous legends of the country of women needs to be strengthened. For example, no reference was cited in section II (lines 67-145). Therefore the meaning of country of women for Taiwanese indigenous groups is not clear. It is hard to understand how to interpret the author's analyses.</p> <p>The biggest challenge in this study is the analysis parts (II to V). It seems that the way the literature was analysed here makes the interpretation of the findings problematic and even somewhat misleading. Without the connections with theories or criteria, it seems like the analysis part is more related to the authors' personal opinions. It is too subjective.</p> <p>Although the author has provided a reference list, it didn't cite properly in the paper. This can lead to serious problems.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The content of the introduction part is too confused. It needs to be revised. In addition, the conclusion part is not well-organized.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hsiao-I Hou
Department, University & Country	Department of Applied English, National Kaohsiung University of Hospitality and Tourism, Taiwan