




# A Linguistic Analysis of Behavioral Adaptations and Communal Values in The Doll's House & A Death in the Stadium

Mojgan Eyvazi<sup>1\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> English Department, Payam Noor University (PNU), Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: m\_eyvazi@pnu.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Mehdi Purmohammad  Department of Cognitive Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada purmoham@ualberta.ca	Reviewer 1: Farhad Namjoo  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Kamdin Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1 Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, paragraph 1, the citation “Henrich & McElreath, 2003; Jakupov et al., 2012; Kolshansky, 1975...” appears, but the rationale for including Kolshansky (1975) is unclear. Please clarify its relevance to current literature.

In paragraph 2 of the Introduction, the phrase “Directing any ethno-cultural changes to positive cultural evolutions, community is also capable to strengthen...” contains grammatical issues. Revise for correctness and clarity.

The last paragraph of the Introduction claims the study is innovative due to an “interdisciplinary approach to literary criticism,” yet there is little literature review on prior interdisciplinary approaches. Add references and contextualize novelty.

In the Methodology section, the criteria for assigning coefficients 1, 2, and 3 are vaguely described. Include detailed criteria or coding procedures to enhance transparency and replicability.

In the Methodology, you mention using the Oxford Advanced Dictionary for determining denotative meanings. Consider providing a brief justification for choosing this particular source.

In Findings, the explanation of Table 1 could be clearer. Specifically, describe the meaning of the sentence ranges in the table columns and how these connect to the analysis.

Throughout the manuscript, terms like “communal values,” “behavioral adaptations,” and “cultural congruity” are used frequently but inconsistently defined. Provide a glossary or standardize definitions early in the paper.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 1.2 Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In paragraph 3 of the Introduction, the sentence “To this purpose, cross-cultural encounters between characters... are perceived as leading entities...” is overly complex. Simplify and clarify the argument.

The Introduction refers to “constructive negotiation between cultures” but does not explicitly define how this concept is operationalized in the analyses. Provide more precise definitions here.

In paragraph 4 of the Introduction, you quote “Bellah, 1995; Volcic, 2011...” regarding critiques of community but do not fully engage with how these critiques relate to your analysis of the texts. Consider expanding this discussion.

The Discussion section, first paragraph, states “positive social values and in the story NO.2. negative communal values have more prominence,” but this appears contradictory to the preceding quantitative results. Clarify or adjust.

Figure 1 and Figure 3 descriptions in the Findings are repetitive. Consider consolidating or differentiating these discussions to reduce redundancy.

The text refers to statistical tests using SPSS and Chi-square analysis (Discussion), but the actual test statistics (chi-square values, degrees of freedom, p-values) are not reported. Include these data.

In the Conclusion, you mention the implication of results on “sustainable development,” but the study does not discuss this concept in depth elsewhere. Either expand discussion or remove the reference.

Author revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.