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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **This article discusses the use of digital innovations in story-telling. To my mind, it is important for practitioners of humanities and liberal arts. They would appreciate the information given in this essay more than students/scholars from technical fields. The essay is very informative and opens up new avenues for the study of narratives, throwing light on how narratology is changing rapidly with the advance of technology.** | I appreciate the reviewer’s thoughtful engagement with our work and their recognition of its contribution to the study of narratives. However, we respectfully clarify that the scope of our article extends beyond humanities and liberal arts practitioners. While the study indeed explores digital innovations in storytelling, it also engages with technical perspectives, addressing computational methodologies, AI-driven narrative generation, and interactive media—topics relevant to scholars from both humanities and technical disciplines.  Our intention is to foster interdisciplinary dialogue, bridging narrative theory with emerging technological frameworks. To ensure this is clearer, we have refined certain sections to highlight the cross-disciplinary relevance of our discussion. We appreciate the reviewer’s insights and believe that these clarifications will further strengthen the manuscript’s accessibility to a wider academic audience. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is appropriate and sums up the main thrust of the essay.** | Agree with the reviewer’s comments. |
| 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 covers all the important ideas embodied in the essay.** | Agree with the reviewer’s comments. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It gives a lot of useful information.** | Agree with the reviewer’s comments. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | * **I am not happy with the references. The subject of the essay is very new, but in the list of books appended to the essay only 4 have a publication date later than 2020.** * **Moreover, internet citations are essential for a subject like this. URLs, links, etc would add credibility to the writer’s research.** * **Within the text of the essay it would be useful to mention relevant websites, etc.** * **In its present form the essay is just a perfunctory stringing together of platforms for writing interactive/immersive stories. No doubt, the information is interesting, but some evidence of greater involvement/research would have added to its appeal** | I appreciate the reviewer’s feedback and their insights on the references and research depth. However, we would like to clarify a few points.  Regarding the reference list, while the subject is indeed emerging, our selection of sources is based on foundational works, key recent publications, and authoritative studies that establish the necessary academic context. Many core theoretical frameworks predate 2020, and the inclusion of such references ensures a balanced historical and contemporary perspective. Additionally, we have cited relevant recent works where applicable, and we have now included a few more post-2020 references to address this concern.  On the use of internet citations, while online sources can be valuable, scholarly rigor requires prioritizing peer-reviewed publications and reputable sources over transient web pages. That said, where appropriate, we have now integrated additional credible online resources to strengthen the discussion.  Lastly, regarding the structure and depth of engagement, the manuscript is designed to provide a critical analysis rather than merely listing platforms. The discussion goes beyond technical descriptions, offering thematic insights into their implications for interactive/immersive storytelling. However, to further enhance the argument, we have refined sections to highlight deeper analytical perspectives and reinforce the research narrative.  I appreciate the opportunity to refine our work and trust that these revisions will address the reviewer’s concerns. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The author’s command of language is satisfactory. There are no ambiguities or grammatical errors.** | Agree with the reviewer’s comments. |
| Optional/General comments | * **What is the target audience of the essay? If the writer had to explain that in the beginning, it would help.** * **What are the drawbacks of these “immersive” narratives? Do they lead to some kind of addiction? OR is there some danger that the virtual may replace the real and affect the psyche of the person immersed in this form of story-telling?** * **A critical/analytical perspective is missing.** * **Some abbreviations (like CP/M) have been used without any explanation.**   **Perhaps the writer could address these issues.** | Regarding the target audience, the manuscript is intended for scholars, researchers, and practitioners in the fields of digital storytelling, media studies, and cognitive sciences. While the introduction already implies this, we have now explicitly stated the intended readership at the beginning for greater clarity.  On the topic of “immersive” narratives, the manuscript primarily focuses on their narrative techniques and cognitive engagement rather than their psychological risks. While concerns about addiction and reality displacement are valid, they fall beyond the scope of our study. However, we have briefly acknowledged these debates in the discussion section to provide a more balanced view.  Regarding the request for a critical/analytical perspective, the manuscript already incorporates theoretical frameworks and comparative analyses of immersive storytelling techniques. To address this concern, we have further refined our argumentation and clarified the analytical lens used.  Finally, I recognise the need for abbreviation clarification and have ensured that all abbreviations, including CP/M, are now defined at their first mention.  I appreciate the reviewer’s suggestions and believe these revisions enhance the clarity and depth of the work. |
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