

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Current Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCR_12430
Title of the Manuscript:	Corpus - based Study on the Translation Methods of the Figures of Speech in Zhuang's Folk Songs of Napo
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The use of computer-based corpora allows of a detailed analysis of linguistic features in a unified approach which straddles the distinct categorical systems of stylistics, linguistics, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics etc. It has been in use approximately since 1991 when John McHardy Sinclair published <i>Corpus, Concordance, Collocation</i> , it is therefore a recent method, widely employed, holding a big explanatory potential. In this case, it serves a nuanced interpretation of	Thanks for your comments!
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	uToo lomg, redundant.. A new title has been suggested.	The title is unchanged for the focus of the paper is translation instead of figures of speech.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Succint yet clearly stating object of research and conclusion.	Thanks for your comments!
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Very good structuring of the argument, with chapters and subchapters. Suggestion: the Introduction should not be numbered.	Thank you for your feedback! I referred to other papers in the journal and found that the introduction section is numbered. Therefore, I adopted the same format to maintain consistency and clarity in structure. I appreciate your understanding!
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness	Written in fluent standard English. A good knowledge of tropes, correctly illustrated with examples in a	Thank you for your insightful comments!In my paper, I treat antithesis and contrast

of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	sensitive hermeneutic exercise. One exception: antithesis. It seems that the respective sentence was meant to exemplify parallelism, and the definition of antithesis was left out. The definition has been corrected and another source suggested.	as distinct concepts. Antithesis emphasizes formal symmetry, while contrast highlights content opposition. This differentiation is based on the references I cited.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are strictly limited to the topic, relevant and recent.	Thanks for your comments!
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Remarkably concise and lucid style in undefiled English.	Thanks for your comments!
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Theoretically sound, fully internalized so as to be appropriately applied to reading and interpretation.	Thanks for your comments!

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	