Paper: **"Gender Performativity and Conceptual Metaphors in the Presidential Campaign Discourse: A case study from Georgia"**

Corresponding Author: Nino Guliashvili

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Louis Valentin Mballa
Autonomous University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico

Reviewer 2: Pedro Antonio Martin-Cervantes
University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 3: Aderogba Adeyemi
Osun State University, Nigeria

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The title is a very personal decision of the author, however in this case I advise eliminating the parentheses. Instead, two alternatives should be chosen:

(a) Gender Performativity and Conceptual Metaphors in the Presidential Campaign Discourse: A case study from Georgia.

b) Gender Performativity and Conceptual Metaphors: A case study based on the 2018 Georgian presidential election.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The abstract is quite adequate, however, the use of capitalized terms (as in the whole paper except for the methodological part), does not make much sense. Please correct.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

There are no grammatical errors as such, but there are some gaps that I advise you to correct immediately.

- Please do not use footnotes. Move your content to the main body of the text.

- Do not use proper names but their initials.

- Do not use bold or underlined terms.

I think you should keep these tips in mind for future scientific works.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The methodology is clear and quite adequate, but more emphasis should be placed on justifying why you have used this tool (Antconc) and not other alternatives.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The textual body is also correct, but I miss a greater specification of the political tendencies of each presidential candidate.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusions are also correct, but I think it would be convenient to move the elements contained in the appendix to tables for a better presentation of the work.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

I believe that the tool used in this work has not been referenced. In this link you can find the solution:

https://www.laurenceanthony.net/

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ⦿ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2

- ○ 3
- ● 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ● 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ● Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I agree that the paper should be accepted after applying the proposed corrections. I consider that the underlying term in this work is "Sentimental Analysis", so the author should make it known. Likewise, it should also be noted that this methodology ultimately comes from "Artificial Intelligence", a fact that will make it gain a greater added value.

With my best wishes in your academic and personal life,

The reviewer

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewer Files

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ⦿ Yes
- ◯ No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ⦿ Yes
- ◯ No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ⦿ Yes
- ◯ No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The title is very clear
```

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The abstract is also clear
```

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

```
The paper is very w ell w ritten
```

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The study methods is also very clear
```

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The body of the paper is good
```

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The conclusion is good
```

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

The references are appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4

- ⊙ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ⊙ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ⊙ Accepted, no revision needed
- ○ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

```
Good paper
```

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- ⦿ Yes
- ○ No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
Even though the title is clear enough,
a slight adjustment is
made on the topic.
```

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The abstract is appropriate.
```

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

```
There are few   typographical errors.
```

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The method is appropriate.
```

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
There are few  typographical errors.
```

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```
The conclusion is okay.
```

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

```
The list of references is okay.
```

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4

- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ● 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ● Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author is presented with suggested corrections.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: