

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ARJASS_117757
Title of the Manuscript:	Gender frames portrayed in television series: real-life implications towards women
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides an in-depth analysis of gender frames portrayed in television series and examines their real-life implications towards women, contributing to the understanding of media's influence on societal perceptions and gender roles. 2. Yes, the title "Gender Frames Portrayed in Television Series: Real-Life Implications Towards Women" is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the manuscript, which examines the portrayal of gender in TV series and its impact on women's lives. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, theoretical frameworks, methodology, key findings, and implications. It succinctly summarizes the unequal portrayal of genders in television series and the negative impact on women's real-life perceptions and opportunities. 4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well-organized, with clear subsections including the abstract, introduction, methodology, results and discussion, and conclusion. Each section logically follows the previous one, facilitating a coherent and comprehensive presentation of the research. 5. Based on the provided excerpts, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It uses established theoretical frameworks (framing theory and cultivation theory), employs appropriate qualitative methodologies (content analysis and focus group discussions), and presents findings that align with existing literature on media representation and gender studies. However, a full assessment would require a thorough review of the entire manuscript. 6. The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient but could benefit from the inclusion of more recent sources to ensure the research is up-to-date. Many references are from the early 2000s and 2010s, with fewer recent studies. Including recent literature would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and depth. 7. Suggestions for Additional References: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Martins, N., & Harrison, K. (2012). Racial and Gender Differences in the Relationship Between Children's Television Use and Self-Esteem: A Longitudinal Panel Study. Communication Research, 39(3), 338-357. b. Grabe, S., Ward, L. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2008). The Role of the Media in Body Image Concerns Among Women: A Meta-Analysis of Experimental and Correlational Studies. Psychological Bulletin, 134(3), 460-476. c. Coyne, S. M., Linder, J. R., Rasmussen, E. E., Nelson, D. A., & Collier, K. M. (2014). It's a Bird! It's a Plane! It's a Gender Stereotype! Longitudinal Associations Between Superhero Viewing and Gender Stereotyped Play. Sex Roles, 70(9-10), 416-430. d. Sink, A., & Mastro, D. (2017). Depictions of Gender on Primetime Television: A Quantitative Content Analysis. Mass Communication and Society, 20(1), 3-22. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are some areas where the clarity and precision of the language can be improved to</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>enhance readability and academic rigor.</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar and Syntax: Ensure all sentences are grammatically correct and syntactically clear. For example, "The male gender is portrayed as educated wealthy and bright as well as providers and business people who spend a lot of time discussing business and development." could be revised to "The male gender is portrayed as educated, wealthy, and intelligent, often depicted as providers and businesspeople who spend considerable time discussing business and development." 2. Punctuation: Use commas and other punctuation marks appropriately to improve readability. For instance, "Moreover TV series plays a significant role in shaping society;" should be "Moreover, TV series play a significant role in shaping society;". 3. Vocabulary: Use precise academic vocabulary to convey ideas more effectively. Instead of "This paper sets out to determine," you could say "This study aims to determine." 4. Consistency: Ensure consistent use of terms and concepts throughout the manuscript. For example, if you refer to "television series" in one part, avoid switching to "TV series" in another part without clarification. 5. Conciseness: Aim for conciseness without sacrificing clarity. For example, "Findings from the study reveal unequal portrayal between men and women in TV series," could be simplified to "The study reveals an unequal portrayal of men and women in TV series." <p>Implementing these suggestions will help in making the article more suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment <i>(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)</i></p>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Everon Gomedé</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of British Columbia, Canada</p>