

Manuscript: “**Iconography as a Means of Reaching Political Power:
A Case Study of Three Georgian Presidents**”

Submitted: 08 August 2020

Accepted: 23 March 2021

Published: 31 March 2021

Corresponding Author: Giorgi Aptsiauri

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n9p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Camille Habib, Lebanese University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Eyal Lewin, Ariel University, Israel

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Eyal Lewin	
University/Country: Ariel University/ Israel	
Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
<p>Manuscript Title: ICONOGRAPHY AS A MEANS OF REACHING POLITICAL POWER: A CASE STUDY OF THREE GEORGIAN PRESIDENTS</p>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0879/18	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>In general, the answer is positive, but the point of Georgia as a case study for worldwide conclusions must be stressed.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The abstract can remain as it is.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The writing is fluent and clear, yet I must note that I am not a native English speaker.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>To present things appropriately, the author must mention the exact biographical sources and the specific techniques of interpretation. Now it looks like merely commentary and must be presented more scientifically. Certainly, giving more than a short paragraph will at least give a better impression.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The main body is in a chapter titled "Iconography." This should be changed. The current chapter should be split into a theoretical one, that is – the excellent literature review, and then an analytical chapter where the core of research lies.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions ought to be articulated into something more general, more conclusions that are relevant no matter if the reader comes from China, Italy or Egypt.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>Please bear in mind that I am no expert in this specific field.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think that the subject, as well as the research itself, are genuine and carry novelty. It is professionally written and certainly deserves to be presented in a scientific journal as well as in conferences. Revising it will also raise the chances for citations. Good luck!