



Manuscript: “**The Rise of British Cultural Identity in Othello by Shakespeare**”

Submitted: 08 September 2020

Accepted: 17 October 2020

Published: 31 October 2020

Corresponding Author: Dramane Ouattara

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p177](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n29p177)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nino Kemertelidze
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Shaimaa Hassanin
Horus University, Egypt

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: Nino Kemertelidze	
University/Country: Georgian Technical University/Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 12.09.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 18. 09.2020
Manuscript Title: THE RISE OF BRITISH CULTURAL IDENTITY IN SHAKESPEARE’S OTH	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	

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.	5
The title is clear enough and is absolutely straight to the point of the content of the paper. The topic of the article is rather interesting and important as the interest in Shakespeare, his plays, and the problems discussed and displayed in each of them never fades among scholars as well as broad society. These problems are topical and urgent even today, 5 centuries later. It is hard to imagine world literature without Shakespeare’s tragedies, comedies, chronicles, or sonnets.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and	4

results.	
<p>The abstract almost meets the required criteria. It briefly renders what the article is about. Though while reading the abstract, a reader realizes the basic issues that are described in the article, I think that it is more general. Besides, to my mind, it would be better if the abstract contained some elements of the conclusion, at least its last sentence what would make the whole abstract more solid and complete.</p>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<p>There are a lot of grammatical, stylistic, lexical mistakes throughout the text. I tried to correct only some of them but I strongly recommend the author to look through the whole text and present the better English version. There are some rather vague sentences. I understand what the author means, but they should definitely be written in better English (I have highlighted some of them). Besides, I'd like to pay the author's attention to one issue: it is certainly possible to use present tenses while making an analysis, but in this case the sequence of sentences should be maintained. I have corrected some cases, but the author should correct every case very thoroughly. In addition, I'd like to remind the author that we never use present perfect tense if we speak about people are passed awa (are dead). Besides, we meet rather elevated words and phrases that are absolutely out of place (e.g. Brabantio is cognizant of the working of his traditional society and the genesis of most household troubles). To my mind instead of "cognizant" it is better to say "well-aware" or some other simple words and instead of the "genesis" – the cause of most of his household troubles. It is the author who can make such changes if she certainly agrees.</p>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<p>The study methods are not explained clearly enough. Mostly, the author brings other scholars' views about the discussed issue and highlights her viewpoints. To my mind, such an approach is acceptable for the topic of the presented paper.</p>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<p>The architectonics of the paper is good enough. The text is built in such a way that each part is logically linked with another. As the topic concerns British cultural identity in W. Shakespeare's Othello, the author gives more general considerations in the introduction what is followed by three sections in which she develops the set problem and specifies the issue.</p>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<p>This is the section that I like most of all. The author briefly summarises the main idea of the research and opens Othello's personality well enough. The final sentence of the conclusion "Through Othello's opposition to Venetian traditional ways, Shakespeare aims to reinforce the quest for a national identity which may confirm the originality along with the particularity of Venetians' identity within the globalized trends individual identities are submitted to" really summarises the whole research.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<p>The bibliography is rich enough. It comprises contemporary researches and also old ones. It includes 21 references what is quite an acceptable number for an article. The references are listed in alphabetic order.</p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please, read carefully my comments and revise the text accordingly. Generally, it's not bad research, but English should necessarily be corrected.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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: Dr. Shaimaa Hassanin	
University/Country:	Horus University- Egypt
Date Manuscript Received: 12-9-2020	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: THE RISE OF A BRITISH CULTURAL IDENTITY IN SHAKESPEARE'S OTH	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0997/20	
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.	5
<i>The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract does not give a clear vision of the content of the paper, and the researcher needs to reconsider it.</i>	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are some grammatical and structural errors in the paper. The researcher has to go through the paper and make modifications in the language, grammar and the use of vocabulary, prepositions and punctuation.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The method needs to be clear.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is clear, but the researcher needs to reconsider long sentences (Ongoing sentences)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is good and signifies the main idea of the paper. It also explains the main findings of the paper</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references are appropriate and serve the work.</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 recommend this paper for publication in the ESJ after the author goes through the few spelling, grammatical mistakes and language structure.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: