

**Paper: “Harmonizing Aesthetics and Psychological Well-being: An Indepth Exploration of the Integrative Impact of Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures”**

**Submitted: 16 January 2024**

**Accepted: 16 February 2024**

**Published: 29 February 2024**

Corresponding Author: Mehrasa Nikandish

Doi: /10.19044/esj.2024.v20n6p131

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Mary Hollingsworth  
Liberty University, USA

Reviewer 2: Olena Kovalchuk  
Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine

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: Mary Ann Hollingsworth	
University/Country: Liberty University, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: January 23, 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: January 27, 2024
Manuscript Title: Harmonizing Aesthetics and Psychological Well-being: An In-depth Exploration of the Integrative Impact of Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 26.55,01,24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes/No</span>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes/No</span>	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <span style="background-color: yellow;">Yes/No</span>	

## **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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>2</b>

<i>The title adequately represents the content of the manuscript, but the subtitle needs to more accurately reflected focus from the abstract such as exploration of indirect relationships with aesthetic intelligence, aesthetic sensitivity, environmental beauty, etc.</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>There is clear presentation of study objectives, methods employed, analysis conducted, and resultant findings of the study.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The article has good alignment with scholarly organization and writing standards.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There is a discrepancy between the study school year in the abstract (2018-2019) and the methodology section (2019-2020). This needs to be corrected. Information is missing on content of the instruments used. This needs to be clarified. Research questions and hypotheses are not provided and this needs to be presented along with an explanation of how each question was answered – such as which instruments did this.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>There is minimal explanation of results. Results need to be explained in view of the research questions and findings from each instrument administered. Use of some tables could provide succinct and clear presentation of results as well as some narrative summary.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>While the conclusions may be accurate, these are not supported by the content provided. Answering the concerns in number 5 above would take care of that.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>The reference list seems to include appropriate references. The formatting does not follow APA guidelines with use of italics.</i>	

**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):** Some foundation is here for a good published article. The title needs revision as noted in number one and some

additional information is needed per in the methodology and results sections – see numbers four and five for what is needed more on these.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:** The manuscript has potential for publication if authors follow the above guidelines and notes in the evaluation rubric, The authors probably have the additional information needed and just need to integrate that into what is in the article now.

# 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: Olena Kovalchuk	
University/Country: Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Ukraine	
Date Manuscript Received: 23.01.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 12.02.2024
Manuscript Title: Harmonizing Aesthetics and Psychological Well-being: An In-depth Exploration of the Integrative Impact of Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0155/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	

## 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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>3</b>

The title is clear, however, it partially reflexes the content of the paper. The part about the Integrative Impact of Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures is not revealed.	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
The abstract clearly presents objects, methods, research design, participants and results of the theoretical study. Nothing is mentioned about the Impact of Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures.	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>There are some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. It is recommended to make a correction and review the whole text of the article.</b></p> <p><b>E.g.</b> Aesthetic sensitivity is a distinct human characteristic and probably has a It is a biological function that connects it to sensuous psychology and behaviorism.</p> <p>It looks like the sentence is not completed.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
Authors used the following psychodiagnostic instruments, i.e. the Ryff Well-being Scale (2), the Aesthetic Intelligence Scale developed by Rashid et al. (2017), and Abdulsalami's (2013) Aesthetic Sensitivity Scale. They indicated Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each scale. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>3</b>
The results are not quite clear. On the one hand, the description in Table is not clear "To evaluate the appropriateness of model indices, various criteria were used, the results of which are shown in Table 1." What are the indexes? What are hypotheses? On the other hand, the colourful scheme is without title. It is not readable. Its explanation is poor.	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>4</b>
The research design is clear, however, the Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures is not mentioned in the article. Conclusions should be better structured. Authors refer to the works by other scientists, and little to their own findings.	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
The references are comprehensive and appropriate. The authors refer to the research by Myers, D. G., & Diener, E., Ryff, C. D., Gardner, H. and others.	

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

Accepted, no revision needed	
------------------------------	--

Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

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

**The title of the article is very promising. However, the reader remains disappointed because not all aspects are enlightened. E.g.**

the Integrative Impact of Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures. Nothing is mentioned about it. On the other hand, the problem is interesting and up-to-date.

I recommend the following way out: either to specify the title of the article, omitting the Dysport in Cosmetic Procedures or add the finding about it in the text.

The text should be better structured, the findings explained, the hypotheses set.

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