

**Paper: “Exploring the Phenomenon of Timelessness in Morocco: Insights from Paul Bowles and Other Travel Writers”**

**Submitted: 28 November 2023**

**Accepted: 09 January 2024**

**Published: 31 January 2024**

Corresponding Author: Mohamed El Mehdi Jouay

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n2p46

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paola Clara Leotta  
University of Catania, Italy

Reviewer 2: Reshma Tabassum  
Delhi University, India

Reviewer 3: Blinded

# 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: PAOLA CLARA LEOTTA  |  |
| University/Country: UNIVERSITY OF CATANIA, ITALY   |  |
| Date Manuscript Received: 21/12/2023   | Date Review Report Submitted: 04/01/2024 |
| Manuscript Title: <b>Exploring the Phenomenon of Timelessness in Morocco: Insights from Paul Bowles and Other Travel Writers</b> |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 1227/23   |  |
| 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>Rating Result</i>      |
|------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Questions</i> | [Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>                                | <b>5</b> |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>   |          |
| <i>The method/approach is lacking.</i>  |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>                             | <b>4</b> |
| <i>It is all referred to in the comments</i>  |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>3</b> |
| The method/approach of the literature review should be referred to: systematic, semi-systematic, integrative? |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>  | <b>5</b> |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>  |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>                               | <b>5</b> |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>Please, enrich in-text references</i>  |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Please, enrich bibliographical references and refer to an approach or method for your literature review.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# 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: Dr Reshma Tabassum  |                                      |
| University/Country: Delhi University, India  |                                      |
| Date Manuscript Received:29-12-23  | Date Review Report Submitted: 6-1-24 |
| Manuscript Title: Exploring the Phenomenon of Timelessness in Morocco:<br>Insights from Paul Bowles and Other Travel Writers |                                      |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 1227/23   |                                      |
| 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><br>[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent] |
|--|--|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b> | <b>5</b>                                       |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| The title of the paper is creative and engaging. It also accurately reflects the content of the article.  |          |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| It is important to add some explanation why the author has not dealt with the concepts of post-colonialism and deconstructionism despite mentioning them in the abstract. Also, whether the timelessness refers to all time or it is just a perception of nineteenth and twentieth century?   |          |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>   | <b>3</b> |
| Yes. He held the belief that, <b>(No Comma)</b> following Morocco's attainment.... travel writing <b>reinforces</b> existing power dynamics and <b>reinforces</b> dominant narratives...<br><b>Keywords:</b> Orientalism, <b>otherness, timelessness, postcolonial theory..</b><br>sharing many similarities with other writers of the same tradition, <b>which I will talk about shortly..</b> |          |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| The author must acknowledge and discuss the limitations of the study in the beginning. May be the author can give a short explanation of his approach.  |          |
| <b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>  | <b>4</b> |
| The findings are reliable, but it is important to provide specific examples and evidence to support criticisms.   |          |
| <b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| The conclusion gives insight into the main issues which are discussed in the work. It is clear and sums up the main points discussed in the article.  |          |
| <b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| References are pertinent. The author might want to give more references from the texts of Paul Bowels.  |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revision needed            | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**