



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Breaking The Norms: Analyzing The Use of Graphological Deviations on Merlinda Bobis Poetry
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
Your paper explores a unique intersection of typography and literature. Your mention of Sustainable Development Goal four is a step in that direction. However, the manuscript needs a stronger bridge between literary theory and actual classroom application. Below are my specific thoughts on each section.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Title: The title captures attention. I suggest you remove the colon to create one fluid statement. Also, ensure the capitalization follows the exact manual of style of the journal.
Abstract: The summary is comprehensive. You highlight the dominant stylistic features well. However, to improve the appeal, explicitly state the educational application. How do these exact stylistic choices foster cultural awareness? State the exact mechanism.
Introduction: Your literature review provides adequate background. Yet, the transition from manuscript to printed poems feels abrupt. You need to explain how handwritten individual traits translate into printed typographical deviations. Also, the text mentions the theory of Leech. Ensure you explain this framework deeply so international readers can follow your logic.



Methodology: Your descriptive stylistic approach is appropriate. You selected ten poems. You must detail the exact criteria for this selection. Why these specific ten? Provide a robust rationale to defend your purposive sample. Furthermore, qualitative analysis can be subjective. Detail how you managed bias. Did a second researcher review the texts to confirm your thematic categories?

Results: Table 1 organizes the data well. However, the paragraphs below the table merely repeat the contents of the table. You must synthesize the information. Instead of a simple list, analyze the relationships between these visual features. Which deviations appear together?

Discussion: This section connects your data to broader concepts. Still, it could be more robust. You state that line breaks fracture thought flow. You should cite more recent psychological or cognitive studies to support this claim. Make sure the connection to postcolonial identity is explicit and supported by solid evidence from the poems.

Conclusion: Your final remarks summarize the main arguments. To make it stronger, add clear directives for future scholars. What specific aspects of Southeast Asian literature should researchers explore next?

References: Please audit your reference list. Ensure every citation in the text appears in the final list, and vice versa. Adhere strictly to the required format of the journal.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The paper has an interesting topic and the focus on Merlinda Bobis' poetry can contribute to stylistic studies. However, I have one major concern that affects the validity of the whole findings. In its present form, I have difficulty recommending the paper for publication because the identification of what actually counts as a graphological deviation is not yet clearly established.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The study reports line breaks as the most dominant deviation, but line breaks are already a normal structural feature of poetry. The paper does not clearly explain when a line break becomes a "deviation" rather than simply ordinary poetic lineation. This is important because if almost every line break is counted, then naturally this category will become the most frequent, making the main finding somewhat predetermined. There are also examples that make the classification questionable. For example, "cul-de-sac of belly" is placed under elongation, although it is not clear what letter or sound is being elongated, while some examples identified as spacing appear more like line breaks. Because of this, the categories themselves need to be carefully rechecked before their frequency and meaning can be interpreted. I suggest the



authors establish very clear criteria for each type of deviation, distinguish normal poetic formatting from actual deviation, then re-code all poems based on these criteria and provide the actual counts supporting the claim of dominance. This issue affects the Results, Discussion, and Conclusion, so I believe substantial reanalysis is needed.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			