



Paper: “Digital Assessment of Italian-English Translations of COVID-19 Reports”

Submitted: 20 January 2025

Accepted: 12 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Corresponding Author: Franca Daniele

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p192](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2025.v21n8p192)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nicoleta Calina
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Roxanne Barbara Doerr
University of Brescia, Italy

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: 20 th January 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 27 th January 2025
Manuscript Title: Digital Assessment of Italian - English Translations of COVID-19 Reports	
ESJ Manuscript 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: 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.	5
The title is concise and accurately resumes the content.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The abstract presents in a clear way the objective, the methods and, also, the results of the research	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
I identified several small grammatical errors: p. 1 - Publication of official health reports (The publication) p. 2. - since for Venuti accuracy is somewhat related to a... - something / somehow related to	

p. 3 - However, fluency is a skill that distinctively belongs to human brain – to the human brain
 p. 3, 16 - fluency deals with persons, while accuracy has to do... - fluency deals with people
 p. 11, 13, 17 - All definition are from the PubMed-Medline - All the definitions are from the PubMed-Medline
 p. 15 - sangue, urine e feci devo essere raccolti - devono
 p. 21 - The reasons why such translations have been performed is not clear, - The reasons ... are not clear / The reason ... is not clear
 p. 22 - some linguistic and translation phenomena as well the application of... - as well as the application of...

I would also recommend a more concise language in some situations:

p. 1 - There are a number of ways to conduct translation of official reports – several ways
 p. 4 - into fragments containing approximatively the same number of lines - containing approximately the same number
 p. 5 - F > 90: readability for middle school student - for middle school students
 p. 12 - and can be divided in many branches of medicine - divided into
 p. 14 - For the phrase,...*alle differenze correlate* - For the phrase ‘...*alle differenze correlate*
 p. 16 - Possessives by and large can only be adopted with – *This phrase is not very clear and should be rephrased or inverted commas should be added*
 p. 19 - using a certain amount of technical and sub-technical medical terminology together with some standard language – a certain standard language
 p. 21 - but 10 of the 20 reports were targeted to the general public – targeted at

4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
I consider that the methods are well explained.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The results do not contain errors and are clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The discussion / conclusions are accurate.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are large, comprehensive and recently published.	

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):

I appreciated the ample examples, the detailed data research, and the rich and up-to-date Bibliography.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

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: Roxanne Barbara Doerr	
University/Country: University of Brescia, Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 28.1.25	Date Review Report Submitted: 9.2.25
Manuscript Title: Digital Assessment of Italian-English Translations of COVID-19 Reports	
ESJ Manuscript Number: I do not see a number (it is titled 19.02.2025)	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: This is fine with me	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

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.	3
<i>I believe the title is a bit vague as it is and could use some extra details (what kind of digital assessment, what kind of reports)</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>I have proposed some changes in the abstract (see the attached file) but other than that the abstract is fine.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>There are some evident errors in grammar, syntax and choice of words that sometimes make the reading a little more difficult, especially in the . I made some adjustments using the tracking mode (see the attached file) for the first part of the</i>	

<i>paper as a starting point but I strongly suggest the author(s) closely read through and revise the paper in its entirety.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Some improvements may be made to this section, such as moving the information on the corpus in the Results section to the Materials and Methods section and presenting the original scales as well as the modified ones in order to allow the reader to better understand the extent of the work that was carried out.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clearly presented and illustrated by the author(s).</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are well connected with the author(s)'s thesis, findings and considerations.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive, appropriate and in line with the paper's field of study, methodology and text types.</i>	

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):

The paper deals with a very interesting and relevant matter that should raise awareness of common issues with ITA<ENG translation in view of its impact on the non-expert audience's understanding of disease and healthcare. The author(s)'s claims are well argued and supported by the quantitative data and the qualitative findings. There are some adjustments to be made in terms of language and grammar (especially the use of articles and verb tenses and certain complicated sentences), as well as the positioning of certain pieces of information and some points to be cleared. Please refer to the file with tracking in attachment to the present form.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: