

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJASS_129150
Title of the Manuscript:	Female Undergraduates' Perception of Feminism Depictions in The Woman King Film
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article provides an overview and systematic portrayal of the feminist representations in the movie <i>The Woman King</i> . While the topic is intriguing, and the author has conducted thorough research, the arguments are not always clearly articulated, which limits the delight of reading such an engaging theme, e.g., "seeing women doing exploit (SEING WOMEN BEING EXPLOITED)" (p. 1). The issue seems to stem from linguistic inconsistencies regarding repetitive vocabulary (e.g., The word "depictions" is overused. Instead, English provides a joyful playground to apply synonyms such as "illustrations, images, characterizations, descriptions, etc., or participial adjectives like "depicted"). Furthermore, a lot of the sentences are overly extended. The writing style could benefit from dividing those sentences into shorter syntactic units. Significant grammatical errors were noticed, including the omission of articles (e.g., "THE same women" (p.1), "aN in-depth portrayal" (p. 9)), misused prepositions (e.g., "criticized by (FOR) their ability" (p. 6)), numbers (e.g., "12" (TWELVE) (p. 8)), and a lack of subject-verb agreement, e.g., "the media play" (p. 5) vs. "the media plays" (p. 13). Moreover, punctuation rules need to be reviewed to facilitate easier reading, especially regarding commas and full stops, so that the reading flow is non-disrupted. Attention is also needed to improve spelling, particularly with complex nouns like "all female war troop (ALL-FEMALE WAR TROOPS)" (p. 8) and "child bearing (CHILDBEARING)" (p. 6). In addition, parts of speech need attention in noun phrases (e.g., "in the selectED movie" (p.1), "feminist depictions," and "feminism depictions"). The countability of nouns should also be considered (e.g., "contents" (p. 13)), as well as gerunds and infinitives. Once those mistakes are corrected, the article will be much smoother to read. Stylistically, a preachy tone should be avoided by finding examples from movie scenes to support claims and draw conclusions from raw data. Presenting more empirical details would showcase how selected university students were surveyed, highlighting similarities and differences in their opinions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable for the research content.	
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.	Although the abstract is of proper length, the division into named paragraphs makes it chopped, disturbing the reading flow that needs to catch the readers' attention from the start.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Even though the article uses a scientifically relevant argumentation system, it lacks concrete examples from the movie that would support the concluding statements.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author has considered recent relevant existing literature and publications. However, since gender differences were mentioned in the article, it would be interesting to tackle contributions of Judith Butler and Kate Millet in developing the Feminist Theory.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Improving the language will enhance clarity and ensure the message is conveyed effectively.	
Optional/General comments	The article can be published after making necessary additions and revisions.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marija Glisic Dunovic
Department, University & Country	University of Belgrade, Serbia