

Paper: “Henrik Ibsen’s The Wild Duck: A Research-Based Study of the Psychosocial Risk Factors of Hedvig’s Suicide”

Submitted: 17 May 2023

Accepted: 24 July 2023

Published: 31 July 2023

Corresponding Author: Safaa Fahes

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2023.v19n19p26

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Maheen Bint

Dow University of Health Sciences, Karachi, Pakistan

Reviewer 2: Olena Kovalchuk

Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Mary Hollingsworth

Liberty University, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Mary Ann Hollingsworth	
University/Country: Liberty University/USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 062323	Date Review Report Submitted: 062723
Manuscript Title: <i>The Wild Duck's</i> Hedvig: An Adolescent Dragged to Suicide	
ESJ Manuscript Number: __28__04,06.20__	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: 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	

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 does accurately describe the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(The abstract describes the focus of the paper, but does not present objects, methods, and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are some writing errors that a program such as Grammarly could help to correct.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The beginning of the methodology section indicates how the study is conducted, but the narrative of this needs more clarity to identify and specifically analyze each ‘why’ that the author presents.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	2
<i>While the discussion in the methodology section eludes to some results, there is a lack of clarity as to the larger purpose of the study and what was understood from this study.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusion does describe the discussion of the paper, but there is no sense of what concluding thoughts might prompt further benefit from the study for readers, other researchers, etc.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Very few references could be considered current as most are before the year 2000. If this were to be a study within the context of adolescent suicide, there should be many more references available within the last 5 to 10 years.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The study could offer a stronger contribution to research on adolescent suicide if there was a synthesis with more current research and data on adolescent suicide. Also, the methodology section would be stronger if this narrative was further organized into subsections that addressed each “why” of suicide influence that was presented. With the abstract, remember to present summary of the objects, methods, and results of the

study. The conclusions should provide some reflection on further utility of the study for researchers, practitioners, educators etc.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

With the suggested revisions to the author, this article could be acceptable for publication in the journal. It addresses a real-world challenge and with some revision could be a useful contribution to study and work with the issue of adolescent suicide.



ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2023

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: Maheen Bint e Qamar	
University/Country: Dow University of Health Sciences, Karachi, Pakistan.	
Date Manuscript Received: 15 June 2023	Date Review Report Submitted: 23rd June 2023
Manuscript Title: The Wild Duck's Hedvig: An adolescent dragged to suicide	
ESJ Manuscript Number: ---28.---04.06.2023 (1)--- (1)	
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>The title conveys the topic in a clear and concise manner. However, it could be improved if the type of study is also highlighted in the topic.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The abstract provides a general overview of the topic and purpose of the paper; however, it does not explicitly mention the specific objects, methods or results. Instead, it outlines the focus of the investigation, which is the suicide of Hevdig Ekdal in Henrik Ibsen's play, "The Wild Duck," and the intention to fill the gap in existing literature by exploring the socio-physiological roots of her suicide. The abstract does not provide the specific details about the methods or anticipated results of the investigation.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The overall grammar and clarity of the article were generally good, with some room for improvement and correction. No noticeable spelling mistakes were observed; however, the phrasing of the sentences and vocabulary could be improved for greater clarity.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>Although the methodology provides a broad understanding of the topic and includes references to the relevant literature, it lacks the specific details on how the data was collected or analyzed. It seems to rely primarily on previous research findings and theories rather than presenting new empirical data or conducting original research.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and concise and do not contain any notable errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The findings are notably clear and encompass various factors explored in the study, shedding light on the potential causes of adolescent suicide. This effectively communicates the likely underlying reasons behind Hevdig's suicide.</i>	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are generally comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

