

Paper: “**Language Play in Postmodern Literature: A Study of Lydia Davis' Stories**”

Submitted: 30 October 2024

Accepted: 28 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Nino Kemertelidze

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2024.v20n32p23

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Steven John P.

Eastern Technical University of Sierra Leone, Kenema City, Sierra Leone

Reviewer 2: Awwad Ahmed

Taif University, KSA

Reviewer 3: Blinded

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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: John Pahoni Stevens	
University/Country: Eastern Technical University of Sierra Leone/ Kenema City Sierra Leone	
Date Manuscript Received: 31 st October 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 6 th November 2024
Manuscript Title: Language Play in Postmodern Literature (based on Lydia Davis' stories)	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>The role Language Plays in Postmodern Literature (Based on Lydia Davis' stories) or The role of Language in Postmodern Literature (Based on Lydia Davis' stories)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>Please delete all the writings highlighted in RED and state the methodology clearly where it is descriptive and analytical or purely narrative</i>	

(analyzing the language play in Lydia Davis' stories, focusing on textual features such as word choice, narrative structure, and stylistic devices). Let this be reflected in the Abstract	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The write up is okay with little grammatical errors</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The methodology is accurate</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Some of the sentences are too longer than expected</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is supported by the content</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>I will prefer the author uses more recent works as references and citations dating after 2010 or at least 2005</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The write up is an integral part to language analyses in literature and it related works. It is an academic write-up therefore I will prefer the author(s use more recent works as references and citations dating after 2010 or at least 2005 to 2024

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

University/Country: Taif University, KSA	
Date Manuscript Received: 1-11-2024	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Language Play in Postmodern Literature	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1130/24	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
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>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title effectively describes the focus on language play in postmodern literature and specifically identifies Lydia Davis. However, it could be more engaging. For example, consider revising it to "Playing with Words: The Subversion of Language in Lydia Davis' Postmodern Narratives" for added intrigue.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract clearly outlines the objectives, methods, and findings of the paper. It succinctly captures Davis' approach and the implications of her language play, maintaining a strong connection to the content.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

While the article is generally well-written, there are minor grammatical errors. For instance, in the sentence “Barth reasonable states that,” "reasonable" should be "rightly" or "correctly." These small adjustments would enhance clarity.)	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The methods section effectively describes the close reading and contextual analysis approaches used. It provides enough detail for readers to understand how the analysis was conducted.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are presented logically and clearly; however, some sections could benefit from additional examples to illustrate points more effectively. For instance, when discussing "The Mice," a specific excerpt could be included to demonstrate the anxieties evoked.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
The conclusions are well-supported by the analysis throughout the article. They accurately reflect the themes explored in Davis' work and connect back to the broader discussions of postmodernism.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
The references are relevant, up-to-date, and provide a solid foundation for the arguments made. They effectively cover both primary texts and necessary theoretical frameworks.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

- Consider a more engaging title to attract readers.
- Please review for minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. For example, the phrase “the exhaustion of traditional forms has given rise” could be simplified to “the exhaustion of traditional forms has led to.”
- Incorporate more specific examples in the results section to support your claims. For instance, when discussing the emotional impact of “The Mice,” including a direct quote could significantly strengthen your argument.
- In the conclusion, reinforce the connection between Davis’ themes and contemporary issues, perhaps by referencing societal anxieties reflected in her work.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

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. The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 31 Oct. 2024	Date Review Report Submitted: 10.11.2024
Manuscript Title: Language Play in Postmodern Literature (based on Lydia Davis' stories)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: No number	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
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>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is clear and gives an appropriate overview of the paper's subject. It could be enhanced by mentioning Lydia Davis to improve specificity, e.g., "Language Play in Postmodern Literature: A Study of Lydia Davis's Stories"	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
The abstract effectively presents the topic and focuses on Lydia Davis's approach to language play within the postmodern literary framework. Even if it provides a view of the paper's objectives and themes, it could be more explicit in outlining the research methods and primary results or insights gained from the analysis.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
There are minor grammatical and citation issues in the paper. For instance, citation formatting is inconsistent, with some quotations missing appropriate citation marks	

or proper attribution details (e.g., author’s first name and year of publication). All citations lack page number(s). We recommend correcting these issues before publication in order to enhance clarity and scholarly accuracy.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
The paper outlines the primary method of close reading effectively and uses it to analyze Davis's texts with insightful connections to postmodern theory. However, we recommend including additional details on why specific stories were chosen for analysis and how they exemplify unique aspects of language play would add depth.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The analysis is thoughtfully conducted, discussing multiple techniques used by Davis (e.g., repetition, paradox, ambiguity). But the paper could benefit from further examples that demonstrate the discussed techniques, which would allow readers to visualize the findings more concretely. Otherwise, it would simply be just an enumeration of these techniques without any input from the authors. Moreover, mentioning previous contributions to the analysis of such techniques in Davis’s work would enhance the scientific nature of the paper.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions summarize the key insights effectively, tying Davis's stylistic approach to broader postmodern themes. The authors could enhance their paper’s impact by discussing potential implications for future studies in postmodern literature.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
While the references are mostly appropriate, some sources are cited inconsistently. For example, in-text citations should consistently follow the same format, with all necessary publication details clearly included. This would significantly improve the paper’s scholarly presentation.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Please see the suggestions included in this review and the attached document with the reviewed paper. Additionally, consider the recommendations below:

Citations need to follow a consistent academic format. Ensure that all quotes are properly attributed with clear in-text citations and corresponding entries in the references section. For example, if following APA style, be sure to include the publication year directly after the author’s name in in-text citations. Additionally, verify that all sources listed in the reference section are cited in the text and that each reference includes complete bibliographic details.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: