

Review Form2

Book Name:	Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2032
Title of the Manuscript:	Artistic Mimesis or Mimetic “Play” in Relation to Sports Theory
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript explores the intriguing intersection of artistic mimesis and sports theory, a unique perspective that enriches our understanding of both fields. The comparative analysis using the "four orders of mimesis" provides a robust framework that bridges the gap between the aesthetic elements of art and the physical dynamics of sports. The manuscript's approach to illustrating the concept of mimetic "play" highlights its relevance in contemporary discourse on sports and art.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Artistic Mimesis or Mimetic ‘Play’ in Relation to Sports Theory" is suitable as it clearly reflects the core themes and scope of the manuscript.	
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 comprehensive and effectively summarizes the main arguments and conclusions of the manuscript. No additions or deletions are necessary in this section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized, allowing for a clear and logical progression of ideas.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The thorough literature review and the application of established theories provide a solid foundation for the arguments presented. The discussion on the relationship between mimetic qualities in art and sport is both insightful and well-supported by theoretical frameworks, ensuring the manuscript's credibility and contribution to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a broad spectrum of relevant literature. No additional references are necessary.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. It is clear and concise, with minimal need for revision.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript offers a novel perspective that could inspire further interdisciplinary research, making it a valuable addition to both sports theory and art studies. This manuscript is well-written, thoroughly researched, and offers significant contributions to the fields of sports theory and art studies.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Konstantinos Mastrothanasis
Department, University & Country	University of the Aegean, Greece