

**Paper: “Comparative Analysis of the Treatment of the Alcestis-Staff by Euripides and by Wilder”**

**Submitted: 07 February 2024**

**Accepted: 07 March 2024**

**Published: 31 March 2024**

Corresponding Author: Franz-Rudolf Herber

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n8p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Luisa Arvide  
Professor, University of Almeria, Spain

Reviewer 2: Stefan Vladutescu  
University of Craiova, Romania

# ***ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024***

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: Stefan Vladutescu	
University/Country: University of Craiova/ Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 19.02.2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 03.03.2024
<b>Manuscript Title: Comparative analysis of the treatment of the Alcestis-stuff by Euripides and by Wilder</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: Academic Director Dr. Dr. Herber.ESJ.Euripides.Wilder.18.2.2024.Second and last version.a	
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>	<b><i>Rating Result</i></b> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The title of the manuscript reflects its content.</i>	

<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The abstract correctly retains the objective, theme, method of investigation and research results.</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>It would be good for the manuscript to be read by a native English speaker.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The method used is appropriate to the topic approached.</i>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The results are relevant.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>The conclusions of the manuscript are based on the investigation carried out.</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>It is necessary to update the bibliography with 4-6 relevant works from 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024.</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):**

As an intrinsic value, the current study is of an excellent level. However, considering that it is addressed to a wide audience that also includes the specialization and theme, with all collegial respect I suggest completing the study with ideas from studies from the 2020-2024 interval. (The most received reference in the bibliography is from 2019.)

I totally disinterestedly suggest some interesting titles from the mentioned period:

Lionetti, R. (2020). A note on Euripides, Alcestis 106. *The Classical Quarterly*, 70(1), 429-432.

Kosmopoulou, D. (2022). The Reception of The Myth of Alcestis in Alcestis of Euripides and in Alcestis And Sweet Dreams of Andreas Staikos. *Concept*, 24(1), 65-86.

Pardo, J. F. R. (2023). Pensar la muerte (y reírse de ella). El discurso de Heracles (773-802) en Alcestis de Eurípides. *Revista Filosofía UIS*, 22(2), 43-61.

Haasbroek, L. M. (2024). The Book of Samuel and the Three-Actor Rule in Classical Greek Tragedy. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, 1-24.

**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: <b>Luisa Maria Arvide Cambra</b>	Email:
University/Country: <b>University of Almeria/Spain</b>	
Date Manuscript Received: <b>February 09, 2024</b>	Date Review Report Submitted: <b>February 12, 2024</b>
Manuscript Title: <b>Comparative analysis of the treatment of the Alcestis-stuff by Euripides and by Wilder</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: <b>0233/24</b>	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <b>Yes/No</b>	

### 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>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>3</b>
The topic is interesting but is not too novel	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>

Without major errors. There are some copied fragments.	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>2</b>
The manuscript is very long in relation to the content and it is weakly structured. The article also should add a deeper analysis	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>2</b>
The article also should add a deeper analysis	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>1</b>
There are not conclusions: the conclusions lack	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
Important bibliography is missing in the references; for example, L.P.E. Parker, "Alcestis: Euripides to Ted Hughes", Greece & Rome, vol.50, no.1, 2003: etc.	

**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):**

The article will improve if these recommendations are taken in account

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