Dear esteemed reviewers,

I would send my sincere gratitude to both of you for giving me your rich and insightful comments. All of them are helpful to my revision, through which I endeavored to make my initial essay more logically persuasive and constructive. I also tried to incorporate all the suggestions into my revision, though I won’t be able to reach out to reflect Reviewer A’s suggestion for exploring how Squid Game “distinguishes itself” from “other bingeable Netflix shows (House of Cards)…with more original comparative analysis” only due to the length issue of my submission. Below are my notes on which parts I did for revision (all are highlighted in yellow), and what comments correspond to them.

**Reviewer A:**

While I am largely persuaded by the author’s theoretical arguments, I felt episode/textual analysis is somewhat limiting. Mostly analysis is limited to the use of web cams and AI-controlled machines/rifles in recruitment and the first game play/elimination process. Crucial scenes such as the Front Man’s (pleasurable?) viewership of the game with a glass of hard liquor and romantic swing music (“Fly to the Moon”) are oddly missing in the author’s truncated and selective episode analysis. I think this particular scene is significant insofar as
allegorizing platformized spectatorship of Netflix’s Western subscribers whose own pleasure of consuming foreign spectacles of surveillance and violence can be attributed to the unprecedented success of Hwang Dong-hyuk’s Netflix K-drama. Panoptic surveillance of all levels of hierarchical labor (both participants and guards whose ranks are signified by circles, triangles, and squares) might be worth unpacking beyond the use of web cams and AI in selected textual evidence.

Yes, I totally agree with that. So although I discussed Front Man’s viewing in page 19 of my original submission, I provide a more detailed analysis of it before moving to its second section. In so doing, I also take into account how panoptic surveillance is applied to other elements of the show, such as the architectural settings and the hierarchized wardrobes of the agents) throughout its other episodes (pages 11-13).

**Reviewer B:**

The author highlights the breach of privacy by the game recruiter with his use and non-consensual record of a body cam, which s/he associates with that of the U.S. police. It is surprising to me that the author plunges into the following conclusion: "the accountability of
police is, then, translated into the accountability of the debt that binds each participant’s life and body" without elaborating on the operation of the body cam and its connotations in the vulnerability of both potential and actual participants (8). While the police equipped with body cams efficiently and “lawfully” pervades the "public and private sectors,"
what the recruiter enacts is unlawful display of the already "datafied" subjects (in the author's word) after he successfully convinces the recruitees of their participation in the game. Moreover, what matters in the recruitment process is the foreclosure of physical and socio-informational mobility in the sense that the recruiter has all the information of the
potential recruiters in advance.

Following this suggestion, I removed the original sentences that made a comparison between the recruiter’s body cam and the police’s in order to avoid readers’ confusion. I totally agree that “The recorded footage of the recruitment process is thus a visual reiteration of what is expected before the very recruitment,” so I revised my account of how the body cam footage can be viewed in this fashion (pages 8 ).

 On page 9, the author states that "the photos displayed on the floor of the room indicate that the debtors were already identified not as human beings whose life and dignity deserve to be respected, but as participants discriminated as inferior subjects due to their debt and their failure to be adapted to the debt economy" (9). I wonder whether the author refers to the
surveillance mechanism or to the "datafied" portraits of the participants in the scene when s/he presumptively argues that it is inhumane.

After closely reading that sentence, I thought that it originally refers to the former but it can be read as the latter meaning. So I revised the sentence in order to avoid the kind of confusion that the reviewer had (page 9).

Lastly, while constantly using the term, “dispositif,” the author offers neither its definition nor the context of the term in the piece. The author does not explain why s/he uses the French term instead of using its widely accepted translation (i.d. apparatus). The term's references differ by theorists (Foucault, Agamben, Althusser, Christian Metz) and disciplines
(film studies, philosophy, political science, and communication studies). While I don't think the author has to trace back to the coining of the term, namely that of Louis Althusser and Jean-Louis Baudry, I recommend s/he consider not only more clearly introducing the term but also giving an account of the term's reference and significance in the piece.

Following this suggestion, I replaced ‘dispositif’ with ‘apparatus’ while also giving my account of what this means (referencing Foucault and Agamben) and what is significant in the context of the essay in the endnote (page 207)

Most importantly, I endeavored to make more convincing my argument that the show’s trope of surveillance capitalism is associated with “Netflix’s data-accumulation and datafication of viewers’ habits and how they affect the successful launching or continuation of popular shows on their streaming platforms.” At the same time, I also agreed on Reviewer B’s concern that I quickly link this association to the “viewers’ self-reflexive reception.,” which he/she argues is a “completely different topic.” So in my revision I removed the sentences which argue for the viewers’ self-reflexive awareness of platformized spectatorship, for instance, “it encourages the viewers to reflect on their viewing practice of Netflix, which is comprised of Wi-Fi connection, personal screen-based devices, a streaming service subscription, and the time to binge-watch its series” (17); and “the show maximizes the degree of screen intimacy and the motifs of consumption and addict that pertain to the bingeable texts.”

At the same time, I also endeavored to demonstrate that *Squid Game*, in its couple of episodes, invites viewers to identify with multiple positions (not only participants’ viewpoints but also those of Front Man and the VIPs), through its mise-en-scene and editing strategies, and that the show’s exposition of multiple screens and monitors, including the LED screen in Front Man’s private room, alludes to the spectatorship of streaming audiovisual media that is marked by the relocation of one experience into other devices and platforms and the availability and interconnectedness of them. In so doing, I elaborated upon the latter point by consulting the insights of Francesco Casetti and Vicente Ortega. Ultimately, I think I am able to convince one that, contra Reviewer B’s reservation, “it is possible that the ordinary viewer of any Netflix shows, the majority of which views it on their cell phones or small screen, identify herself/himself with the Front Man and the VIPs.” This also allows me to make a more salient correspondence between my take of platformized spectatorship and the viewership of binge-watching as originated from multiple interfaces and their corresponding user behaviors.

The result of all these endeavors can be found in pages 19 and 20. I would hope that although Reviewer 2 is not totally convinced of my argument on the interplay of the show’s textual (1st section) and extratextual (2nd section) dimensions, my revision is read as achieving more “coherence and clarity” and thus being “more critically solid in its entirety.”