

Paper: “A Word Visualization Observation: The Hidden Meaning of the Words in Work Environments”

Submitted: 14 July 2021

Accepted: 21 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Guneri Fatma

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n36p19](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n36p19)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Isaac Mhute
Zimbabwe Open University, Masvingo

Reviewer 2: Andrea Strelicz
University of Pannonia, Hungary

Reviewer 3: Dimitra Serakioti
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Prof Isaac Mhute	
University/Country: Zimbabwe	
Date Manuscript Received: 31/08/2021	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: A WORD VISUALIZATION EXPERIMENT: THE SEMANTIC CONNECTION BETWEEN LYING AND FABRICATION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 66.07.2021(2).	
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>It is a good title for the article.</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Fair. They made the illustration, lying, sound like the focus of the study. They must, rather, focus on their basic focus in the study. What general aspects are targetted which would even assist people in analysing other terms as well.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Yes, limited errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The study's subject matter has not been explained. There is too much assumption that everyone knows what visualization is all about. There is also need to develop the focus and objectives further. They need to clearly spell the problem behind the study. They cannot just set to recommend something where there is a problem.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>They are clear, just that their discussion must be anchored in literature.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>Yes, though the issue remains the unclear focus. Everything is analyzed in light of the focus.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Yes, but one would desire more sources especially in discussion and literature review.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

There is need to ensure that your abstract indicates focus of the study. As it is you appear like focusing on analysing the word lying. Problematize the focus and use the word in question as an illustration rather than an end in itself. Your objective cannot just be to make a recommendation. You must focus on solving a problem. Your introduction must clearly spell out major aspects like visualization. As it is, I cannot say out from the introduction what it is. More literature to literature review and anchor discussion in literature.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Andrea Strelicz	
University/Country: University of Pannonia / Hungary	
Date Manuscript Received: 2021.08.31	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: A WORD VISUALIZATION EXPERIMENT: THE SEMANTIC CONNECTION BETWEEN LYING AND FABRICATION	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 66.07.2021	
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.	4
It would be use another title. For example:	

Importance of semantic relationship between words – A word visualization experiment used “lying” and synonyms	
Or similar, but in this way this paper summarily seems a simple test of a software.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
Abstract is compact, but it would change after correction of content according to belows	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
English checking would be preferred	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<p>There cannot be found the reason why <u>important</u> using the semantic word map. What is/was the goal of this experiment?</p> <p><i>SHORT LETARATURE REVIEW</i>: is really short.</p> <p><i>RESEARCH OBJECTIVE</i>.; <i>RESEARCH FOCUS</i>.; <i>METHODOLOGY</i>: : These are too separated and missing the essential information.</p> <p>2. <i>SEMANTIC APPROACH TO THE RELATION BETWEEN “LYING” AND “FABRICATION”</i>: This part contains special literature. It seems as the part of the papers would be mixed</p> <p>It would be advisable to explain what is “(1)” in middle of the page 5.</p> <p>It would be interesting to have any more information about software that used, about settings, and more detail about experiment.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION</i>: This containment explains what kind of benefits can be released using GrafWord. Discussion containment usually not about this topic.</p> <p><i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i>: This part is interesting but too theoretical. Think over the following questions and be more concrete. What areas could have advantages with using GrafWord? Who can have benefits? Generally what kind of new information can be reached by using GrafWord? How can be useful in the future and whom?</p> <p><i>CONCLUSION</i>: It would be interesting to read anything about implication of experiment. It means: What do you do with this result? Where you use it?</p> <p><i>GLOSSARY</i>: Too much (7,5 pages). It would be advisable to think over to make it shorter (for example with lower case), or leave it at all. There is no part of the paper, where Glossary table is referred. My question: Does the software issue values/number for the strength of word relationships? If yes, the evaluation and interpretation of the result can be more informative.</p> <p>Pictures, Tables, and Figures references are missing from the body text.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<p>The purpose of this paper is not clear from the containment</p> <p>Supposedly this topic is important, and useful, but paper doesn't explain properly why</p>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
There is no information about software skills. How many iteration were (if the GrafWord is a kind of iteration process). What were experiences in this experiment? What is the main message of the result (it is not a main message that word map is useful). Who is the target audience that whom you want to sell this result?	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	2
It would be advisable use the APA standard in reference list according to ESJ requirements http://library.williams.edu/citing/styles/apa.php It is suggested to identify the finding date of internet links behind of the links.	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Scientists,

This paper has 7 substantive pages (with 1. page) of 16 pages. More detail would be needed to become a scientific paper.

I would like to recommend you to correct this paper both format and content, because the topic itself is interesting and important (I know because I do text analysis also). You can check other ESJ papers, how a paper looks like properly.

All correction recommendation is a good chance to you to become better scientist. Your being more accuracy is for your future benefit, because it worth □.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Dimitra Serakioti				
University/Country: National and Kapodistrian University of Athens / Greece				
Date Received: 31/08/2021	Manuscript	Date Submitted: 08/09/2021	Review	Report
Manuscript Title: A word visualization experiment: the semantic connection between lying and fabrication				
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0766/21				
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No				
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No				
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/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.	3

<i>The title is not really adequate to the content of the article; this is not actually an experiment. I suggest the title: Word visualization: Semantic relationship between “lying” and “fabrication”.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Methodology is not presented so clear. The abstract does not present the research results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>There are many grammatical and syntax errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Research methodology must be more analyzed</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The research results are quite clear</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions must present the major findings of the study and explain the meaning of those findings</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
<i>This is the main problem of the article. References do not follow APA citation style. In addition, papers and books cited in the text are not listed in the References and vice versa</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Authors,

I find your article interesting and it has a touch of originality. You have presented the research objective and the main research results quite clear –you have to analyze the methodology. However, there are many syntax errors (please see the comments). Furthermore, you must include more references in your article. If you incorporate my comments in the text and follow APA style in references, the article could be published.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

The manuscript needs further revision due to many syntax errors in language use. Research methodology is not presented so clearly. The main problem is that the article does not follow APA citation style, so it lacks scientific background. The authors must include at least 10-15 references in their paper in order to be published.