

Journal Name:	Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOGRESS_12573
Title of the Manuscript:	Translation of Culture-Loaded Words in The Three-Body Problem: A Perspective of Functional Equivalence
Type of the 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>

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript contributes significantly to the field of translation studies by providing a comprehensive analysis of culture-loaded words (CLW) in The Three-Body Problem. It not only highlights the challenges of translating culturally rich content but also offers insights into achieving functional equivalence in cross-cultural communication. This study serves as a valuable resource for translators, researchers, and scholars aiming to bridge cultural gaps through translation. Its focus on Chinese culture in an internationally acclaimed novel promotes global cultural understanding.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title, Translation of Culture-Loaded Words in The Three-Body Problem: A Perspective of Functional Equivalence, is appropriate as it clearly conveys the focus of the study.</p>	

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.	The abstract is detailed and well-structured, effectively summarizing the manuscript's key points. However, including 1-2 specific examples of the findings would enhance its clarity and engagement. Suggestion: Mention the most commonly used translation method or a notable example from the analysis.	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with clear adherence to functional equivalence theory. The analysis is methodical, and the examples provided align with the theoretical framework. Minor clarifications in certain parts (e.g., elaboration on specific emotional equivalence cases) could improve comprehension.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and sufficiently recent. To strengthen the bibliography, consider adding more recent studies from 2023–2024, particularly on functional equivalence or related case studies in translation.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is suitable for scholarly communication. Some minor grammatical issues and phrasing could be refined for improved readability. Example: Simplify overly complex sentences for a broader audience.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is a significant contribution to translation studies. A graphical representation of translation methods used (e.g., a pie chart) could visually enrich the paper. Also, consider a brief section addressing future research directions. No ethical issues are apparent in this manuscript. No competing interests are identified in this manuscript. The manuscript shows originality.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhinandan Guruprasad Pakhmode
Department, University & Country	Manoharbai Patel College of Arts Commerce and Science Deori. Dist- Gondia (M.S), India