



I. K. Press

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGRESS_12137
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Controversial Philosophical Dimensions in Wong Kar-wai's Filmography
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only based on 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer thinks is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://www.ikpress.org/index.php/index/editorial-guideline>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? (Please write a 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 suggestions for additional references, please mention them 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 research is a good attempt to analyse the work of Wong Kar-wai. Aothot has a deep understanding about the director's work.2. Yes3. Yes4. Manuscript has to be more rigorous. Author would have worked on theoretical framewok. Auteur theory has been mentioned but the work has not been analysed on the framework of the theory.5. Methodology is missing in the manuscript. Methos used for analysis would have been mentioned along with the paparameters of analysis. The arguments are supposedly week without proper establishment.6. References of film analysis and theory would have included. For eg.- How to Read a Film by James Monaco, 1977.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is ok.	
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>	-	



J. K. Press

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:	Garima Shrivastava
Department, University & Country	Apex University, India