

Paper: “Appraisal Theory: Can It Be Applied to Visual Images in Isolation to the Text?”

Submitted: 17 February 2024

Accepted: 31 March 2024

Published: 30 April 2024

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Alhuthali

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n11p18](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n11p18)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Appropriate title.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Accordingly.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are explained clearly.
It includes the literature review, methodology, results, conclusions.

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

The body of the paper is clear.

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

The conclusion summarizes the work presented, as well as the examples mentioned above.
It raises some questions that should have been answered, but were not.
It does not point to future work.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

References are comprehensive and appropriate but very extensive bibliography.
It is not in APA style.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title does not mention the focus of the article: women's visual representations.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract could be improved. The problem statement is clear but it does not explain how data are collected and analysed. The reference to Appraisal theory does explain how the author/s employed it.

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

The article should be proofread. There are a few inaccuracies.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The section 'research design' is too short and vague (e.g., How many pictures/ images did you analyze?)

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

I think the paper should be differently organized. First, the literary review section is rather an introduction to the study background, so I would change the section title. The findings are clearly presented, but they are discussed in the "conclusion" section. I would rather change the section title to discussion and add a proper conclusion.

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

see comment above

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It is appropriate and updated.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Author/s

I really appreciated the topic of your paper and the way you dealt with it. However, I think that you should improve its organization to exploit its full potential. As you can see in the comments, you should improve the abstract and the research design section, so that the study is replicable and the reader can better understand the findings. I also think that you change the title of the long section that you call conclusion. I would rather call it discussion. Regarding the conclusion, you could add a paragraph where you summarize your study and the main findings, address the research questions, mention the study limitations and provide suggestions for further research. Finally, you should correct some inaccuracies regarding language use and syntax.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

the title of the paper is connected to the paper but there s no mention of women and their role. which this paper is about.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract section does not clearly present the objects, methods and results. The abstract is simply a short description of the appraisal theory and what it argues about. but there is not mention of what is specifically to be studies, how and what are the expectations or the results.

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

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the methods are shortly described at the introduction section. It is advisable to have a separated section about methodology and it is lacking to state the number of images used ,the source from where the images are taken from, etc. Also, it would be better to

be given a short description on how the appraisal theory has been used to explore the ways in which to analyse the images.

"the source from where the images are taken from, etc", it is stated at the findings section, but this does not mean that it should not be shortly mentioned at the methodology too (managing not to fall into repetitions)

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

YES, the body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.
Findings include both the results and discussion on the findings.

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

YES.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

YES.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

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

4

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

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

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
