
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript 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 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 recommend 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!

Date Manuscript Received:10/3/2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted: 10/7/2016
Manuscript Title:	
Representation of Iraqi War Between Fantasy and Reality in Rajiv Joseph's <i>Bengal Tiger at Baghdad Zoo</i>: a New Historicist Reading	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less 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>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3.0
An adequate explanation of methodology path is missing. "Accordingly, evaluating the play could range from a mission of freedom to ruin of culture. The present reading is thus a chance to understand cultural and intellectual history through literature." Thus, a scientific methodology is missing.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4.0
Text may be at times opaque, but the errors are not nefarious. Had to read certain paragraphs more than once to figure out what author is trying to say.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3.5
Gets clearer half way through	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
Has to explain more lucidly what she means by historicism	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4.0
As mentioned in #4, clarity manifests itself en force with explanations of Joseph's methods ad motivations	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4.5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please avoid unnecessary convoluted sentences which do not add any layers to your interesting writing:

- 1) Evaluating drama through the hermeneutic concepts of new historicism would be helpful in tracing the social and political atmosphere (precision?)

- 2) The research tries to trace the figurative representation of the Iraq war as a historical event and mutually reads the in-between realities as they are represented figuratively paralleling it with the known factual realities as they are in the political speeches, articles of professional analyzers, critics and even ordinary people (meaning?)

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Literary analysis

