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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.** | **After seeing the work, one is reminded of the words said by Mark Twain ‘The two most important days in your life are the day you are born and the day you find out why.’ ~ and one could go on - why I was born a woman.**  **I find it difficult to name the format of the work presented - is it scholarly, popular science, popular science? None of the listed ones fits.**  **The work raises not only complex issues, but attempts to reveal the content of many historically established stereotypes, erroneous judgements about women.**  **A good visualisation and structure of the work makes a pleasant impression on the reader. However, with regard to the visualisation, there is a question about the correctness of using AI. I am sure that the authors themselves could have coped with the drawings. But this question is debatable...**  **Unfortunately, the authors' position is almost invisible during the immersion into the work.**  **After the interesting sections, there is no summary, no conclusions, no conclusion.**  **It is also missing at the end of the book.**  **Undoubtedly the authors have done a lot of work, but it takes time and intellectual effort (not AI) to format it decently.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title quite reveals the main content of the presented book. To some extent it is original, as it is aimed at revealing female psychology and power from within, despite the fact that there are works/books with a title that contains the words from the title Unveiling the Power Within.**  [**https://www.amazon.com/Unveiling-Power-Within-Positive-Thinking/dp/B0CWWL6VM4**](https://www.amazon.com/Unveiling-Power-Within-Positive-Thinking/dp/B0CWWL6VM4)  [**https://www.formulaofplusminus.com/post/unveiling-the-power-within**](https://www.formulaofplusminus.com/post/unveiling-the-power-within) |  |
| 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 describes the content of the paper in a general way, but we would like to draw attention to several important points:**  **The wording of the purpose of the research is used - but the content of the paper itself is not a research, neither theoretical nor empirical research results are presented. There are no references to works, authors' opinion is not presented, etc.**  **It would be good if the abstract was finalised and structured:**  **For example, such points as: purpose, structure, main topics, what is the originality and main differences of the presented book from others, who is the potential reader (to whom it is addressed) were reflected** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | **The images shown are generated by AI (Created using ChatGPT and DALL-E. OpenAI). This is the first time I have encountered such a reference. But there is an assumption that such an active use of AI will be extended to the text of the work.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | **The list of references has a separate life and is in no way related to the work. There are practically no references to sources. Number 4 - it is not clear at all what source.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English is clear, easy to understand, with no errors or typos. |  |
| Optional/General comments |  |  |
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| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the 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 detail)* |  |
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