

Review Form 2

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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it bridges the gap between two seemingly disparate fields: art and sport. By exploring the concept of mimetic play, it provides a novel perspective that can lead to a deeper understanding of human behavior and creativity. The manuscript's interdisciplinary approach is appreciated, which encourages collaboration between scholars from different fields and fosters a more holistic view of mimetic activities. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed explanation of its methodology to strengthen its conclusions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title lacks precision and specificity, which might confuse readers at first glance. It is recommended to revise the title according to the core content and scope of the chapter to achieve clarity, consistency, relevance, and conciseness. Firstly, the use of the quoted term "mimetic 'play'" may confuse readers, as the definitions and scope of these terms are not clearly defined. This ambiguity can prevent readers from quickly grasping the research theme of the chapter. Therefore, it is advisable to use more specific terminology to clarify the topic and scope, allowing readers to immediately understand the focus of the chapter. Secondly, the title mentions both "artistic mimesis" and "mimetic 'play'" without explaining their relationship. This inconsistency could lead to confusion, as readers might not know whether the chapter addresses a concept common to both terms, or explores the comparison, connection, or other aspects between them. To resolve this, one could choose a primary concept to discuss or clarify the relationship between the two in the title, ensuring that readers understand the necessity of both terms appearing together. This would ensure consistency and coherence in the title. Additionally, the title refers to "sports theory" without specifying which particular theory, making it appear vague and less targeted. To enhance relevance and appeal, it is recommended to specify the particular sports theory or field in the title if possible, making it more precise and focused. The original title does not effectively reflect the logic and content of the chapter. The core elements of the chapter are the comparison between art and sport, which should be clearly indicated in the title. “Play” is a key conclusion and must also be reflected. Maybe the author can change the title to: “Exploring Mimetic Play: Comparing Mimesis in Art and Sport”. This title is concise and clear, directly pointing out the core concept of the chapter, “mimetic play,” and emphasizing the comparative nature of the study, making it immediately apparent to the reader. Additionally, this title is suitable for a wide audience, effectively conveying the core concept and research method of the chapter.	

Review Form 2

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 of the article is comprehensive as it clearly outlines the main objectives, methodologies, and findings. However, enhancing the academic depth and value by including more specific terms and details could make it more engaging for readers. Mentioning key theoretical frameworks or models, along with the practical significance of the findings, would help in conveying the full scope and importance of the research. The abstract mentions the “four orders of mimesis,” but only lists three paradigms (premodern, modern, postmodern). This presents an inconsistency. Also, the frequent use of “I” detracts from the objectivity and formal tone expected in academic publications. Academic abstracts should be impersonal and focus on the research rather than the researcher. Instead of using “I,” consider using passive voice or third-person constructions to maintain a professional and unbiased tone.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	After conducting a comprehensive analysis of the titles, abstract, keywords and subsections, several logical and structural inconsistencies were identified. The title and key words explicitly indicate a comparison of mimetic “play” in art and sport. However, the subtitles do not clearly reflect this comparison. For instance, the literature review section is divided into “Premodern Paradigm,” “Modern Paradigm,” and “Postmodern Paradigm,” as well as “Huizinga’s Homo Ludens” and “Nietzsche’s ‘Play’.” While these subtitles are related to mimetic “play,” they do not directly address the comparison between art and sport. Consider adding specific subtitles that explicitly mention the comparison between art and sport to better reflect the core theme of the title. The abstract mentions the “four orders of mimesis,” but the subtitles only list three paradigms (premodern, modern, postmodern). This presents an inconsistency.	
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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically and technically sound. Firstly, the structure of the manuscript is clear and well-organized, as evidenced by the logical progression from the introduction to the literature review, followed by discussion and conclusion. This systematic approach reflects thoroughness and clarity. Secondly, the manuscript draws on the theories of renowned scholars such as Huizinga and Nietzsche, providing a solid theoretical foundation. Thirdly, the detailed exploration of premodern, modern, and postmodern paradigms, along with an in-depth analysis of mimetic “play,” demonstrates rigorous analytical methods and careful reasoning that effectively support the research conclusions. Lastly, the manuscript’s attempt to compare the concept of mimesis in art and sport, identifying “play” as a common element, showcases an innovative and interdisciplinary perspective.	

Review Form 2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The most recent literature cited is from 2010, which is 14 years old. It is recommended to incorporate more recent literature to reflect the latest advancements and findings in the field	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is generally clear and easy to understand, with well-defined terms and concepts. The sentences are structured in a logical manner, allowing readers to follow the argument progression without confusion. Additionally, the article effectively employs specialized terminology which are relevant to the fields of art and sport theory. These terms are used correctly and consistently, enhancing the scholarly tone of the article. The grammar is generally accurate, but there is need for improvement in the finer details. Notably, there is a punctuation error in the abstract: the phrase "art and sport,, then it appears" contains two commas. This can leave a negative impression on readers and undermines the academic rigor of the work.Overall, the sentence structure is complex yet coherent, suitable for an academic audience. Furthermore, the logic of the article needs to be strengthened, especially in highlighting the process of comparing the fields of art and sport. The transition from others' theories to one's own arguments should be smooth to ensure the coherence of the writing. The English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, attention should be paid to avoiding overly colloquial and subjective tones, as well as addressing minor grammatical issues to further enhance its readability and professionalism.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript would benefit from increased logical rigor and reduced inconsistencies. Emphasis should be placed on the comparative process to enhance clarity. Additionally, the language needs to be more academic; for instance, the use of "I" should be minimized. Titles should be distinct and separate from the content they introduce.The title "2.12.1 Orders of Historical Mimesis consisting of:" is inappropriate as it conflates the title with content.	

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:	Xiao, Peng
Department, University & Country	Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, China