



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_36988
Title of the Manuscript:	A decipherment of the Eteocretan inscription from Psychro (Crete)
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	The text of the article is organized not well. It is not clear 1. who is the target reader of this article? 2. what is the purpose of the article? 3. what methods of research were used (methods are not named)? Where the research was carried out? What was the purpose? Where did the author took manuscript from? Was the author the first to decipher that manuscript? Anyway, the methodology looks like theory. Besides, if the aim was to analyse the manuscript why to describe the coins? 4. Results are difficult to understand because of the not good usage of English language (i. g. sentence 133 has a grammar error). 5. The material is difficult to read and to understand (i.g. 144 sentence "Now let's look at the words? But where to look? Which words and a lot of such places in the text). 5. Discussion should include different points of view, so there wasn't any discussion. 6. Conclusion should depict the findings and realize the purpose of the article. 7. References usually are written according to APA rules (in most journals). As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper. Kindly see the following link: http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20	Com. No. 1 & 2: New lines 44-49 have been added (and highlighted). Com. No. 3: what methods ? Methods are reported in section 2 (2. Methodology), which has been renamed to "Decipherment Guidelines". Extra material has been added throughout this section. Where the research was carried out? In our homes, and we don't see the validity of this information for your readers. What was the purpose? See Com. No. 1 & 2. Where did the author took manuscript from? It had been already reported in the "1. Introduction" section and in Fig. 1 by reference [3]. Was the author the first to decipher that manuscript? No, the relevant references (new lines 39-41) had been already provided in section 1 ("Intorduction"). why to describe the coins? To provide the overall religious context and to verify the validity of this approach in other terms, as it has been additionally stated in new lines 106-131. Com. No. 4: Section 3 rephrased (and highlighted) in many points. Com. No. 5a: Extended explanatory material has been added (and highlighted) in section 2. Com. No. 5b: We have erased the word "Discussion" from section's 3 heading (new line 200), since we have nothing else to discuss there. The different points of view had been already presented and commented in the first section (1. Introduction). Com. No. 6: Conclusion amended (and highlighted) accordingly. Com. No. 7: We have followed exactly the reference style suggested by the Editors, in the downloaded 1349769084-SDI_Paper_template_2003. If the Editors wish so, they may suggest another style that we will comply with.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	If the author re-organize the material, it can be printed	Amendment of Headings (No. 2 & 3) and content.