

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_95641
Title of the Manuscript:	Under Construction: The Female Gaze in Women Director's Film
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:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Author/s should adapt his/her/their manuscript based on the template.</p> <p>Introduction section should briefly place the study in a broad context and highlight why it is important. It should define the purpose of the work and its significance, including specific hypotheses being tested. The current state of the research field should be reviewed carefully, and key publications cited or create a new section. Please highlight controversial and diverging hypotheses when necessary. Finally, briefly mention the main aim of the work. Keep the introduction comprehensible to scientists working outside the topic of the paper. To help you, here is a list of items that can be included in this section: -What is the importance of making this research/contribution that it brings to the literature in the field? -Why should readers be interested? -What problem / gap resolve / fill this research? -To fill this gap (resolve this problem) what solution / intervention / benefits does this research bring? (In other words, how the proposed study will remedy this deficiency / gap / problem and provide a unique contribution to the literature) -What is the research question which addresses the purpose of the research?</p> <p>Methodology section is absent. Some information that should be included in this section is presented scattered. New methods and protocols should be described in detail while well-established methods can be briefly described and appropriately cited. Give the name and version of any software used and make clear whether computer code used is available. Include any pre-registration codes. This section needs major revision. To help you, check this reference that you could consult and use: https://doi.org/10.5430/irhe.v6n1p1</p> <p>The discussion section lacks bibliographic documentation/reference. Please cite more of the journal papers published by Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies where possible.</p> <p>Conclusions section is very simple and looks poor. Please extend this section or you could merge it with discussion section and rename it to "Discussion and Conclusions" with a minor revision.</p> <p>Certain sections of the manuscript begin or end abruptly, which may reduce the reader's attention or interest. I would suggest you could consider including some introductory paragraphs regarding the content of each section, in order to give the reader an idea of what to expect. After the revision of your manuscript (in all sections), you may need to revise or re-edit the abstract or even the title.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Kindly check for grammatical and syntax errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>You may need to move some parts to other sections for there to be a logical flow. Comparative analysis with the state-of-the-art studies is required. Kindly read your manuscript again with a clear mind and make the necessary corrections.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Constantinos Nicolaou
Department, University & Country	School of Journalism and MC, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece