

**Paper: “Class, Power, and Social Change: A New Historicist Approach to August Strindberg’s Miss Julie and Anton Chekhov’s The Cherry Orchard”**

**Submitted: 19 August 2024**

**Accepted: 16 October 2024**

**Published: 31 October 2024**

Corresponding Author: Salam Baba

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n29p12](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n29p12)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edona Llucaçaj  
University College Beder, Albania

Reviewer 2: Louis Valentin Mballa  
Autonomous University of San Luis Potosi, Mexico

Reviewer 3: Maurice Gning  
Berger University, Senegal

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

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

The title is adequate for the article, not too short or too long.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract is well- built, includes the necessary information, and is compliant with the article. However, there are no "Key words"

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

There are grammatical errors that should be fixed before publication; most of these terms, sentences or clauses have been highlighted.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The Methodology is clear and well-built. It sheds light on the theory and approach for the undertaken analysis.

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

The body is clear. Both plays have been analyzed following the same structure format and analysis form. However the rejection of the evil-good polarity mentioned in the introduction and conclusion should be more obvious and well-supported in the body/analysis. The marginalization referred to in the introduction is not elaborated in the body.

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

The conclusion is adequate and accurate. However, the issue of marginalization mentioned in the introduction as a main result of the undertaken in the analysis is not present in the body and conclusion.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The list of References could be enriched with secondary sources which could be added along with their supportive information in the Body of the article.

*Please rate the TITLE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

*Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

It is necessary to undertake a final review to enrich the references and include more points that would support the points of this study and empower the article.

Also "Key Words" should be added.

-----

-----  
Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----

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

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

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The Abstract is good.

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

The manuscript is well written.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methodology is well defined

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

Yes

**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]

5

*Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the METHODS of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the BODY of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

*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):**

The article meets all the requirements to be published

-----

-----

Reviewer E:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

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

The title is quite appropriate

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

all required elements are present in the abstract

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

The text is well written. The language is clear and simple.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are well explained. However, the authors have wasted much time explaining the main tenets of New Historicism that constitutes their main analytical tool. They should rather favour an in-depth analysis of the texts basing on the chief principles of New Historicism that only needs to be briefly explained

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

The text is clear, original and convincing enough even though the outline could be ameliorated as well as the conclusion.

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

The conclusion is the weakest part of this work. It is too general and almost makes no mention of the novels under study. The authors must seriously improve the conclusion by emphasizing the major points of the textual analysis.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

The references could be improved. The authors should consult critical and updated works on Strindberg and Checkov . In addition, all works cited in this paper do not appear in the references. The authors must go through the whole text and add in the bibliographical references the works cited in the body of the work.

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

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

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

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

-----