

Paper: “Whale Watching Tours as a Cultural Object in Fiction – Jojo Moyes’ Silver Bay”

Submitted: 19 November 2020

Accepted: 25 December 2020

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Alexandra Marginean

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p14](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p14)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gamal Elgezeery
Suez University, Egypt

Reviewer 2: H.A. Nishantha Hettiarachchi
University of Sri Jayewardenepura, Sri Lanka

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!

Date Manuscript Received: November 26, 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: November 29, 2020
Manuscript Title: WHALE WATCHING TOURS AS A CULTURAL OBJECT IN FICTION – JOJO MOYES’ SILVER BAY	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 19.12.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
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.	4
The title is relevant to the content of the paper.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
The abstract is somewhat too general. It needs to be rewritten in order to introduce the topic, show the method, and highlight the results.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
Errors and mistakes are rare in this article. I have noticed only one misspelling: pulled herself out form the paralysis (“form” should be “from”).	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The researcher specifies the methods she follows in her study.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusion is accurate and related to the body of the article. However, the researcher may elaborate it by providing an overview of the findings in all the sections of the article and relating them together.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The researcher includes the references she has used in her study and arranges them alphabetically.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is good and needs only some minor changes. The abstract must be rewritten in order to be clear, comprehensive, and to the point. The conclusion may be elaborated in order to highlight the results of each section and relate them together.

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. HAN Hettiarachchi	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 22.12.2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 24.12.2020
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 19.12.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No YES	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	04
The title is an inclusive which clearly depicts the content.	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	05
Abstract too is clear and methodical. It reflects all the necessary requirements and condense the content of the manuscript.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	04
There are no, lexical/grammatical errors in the manuscript.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	03
It is suggested to incorporate the study method briefly, to elaborate that why this was particularly selected.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	04
The author has clearly written this part which reflects the theme chosen to write the manuscript.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	05
The conclusion is strong enough and accurate.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	03
The list of reference has been prepared methodically and all those directly related to the theme. Being an academic (my personal view) it is not that much suitable of using WIKI (such as Wikipedia) information for academic writing. If the author avoids WIKI information/reference which have used herein it will be an added advantage to increase the quality of this manuscript.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

* - See the comments given in section 07

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: