

**Paper: “Socioemotional Linguistic and Rhetorical Markers of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: Insights from Academics across Lebanese Universities”**

**Submitted: 05 February 2025**

**Accepted: 28 March 2025**

**Published: 30 April 2025**

Corresponding Author: Nawal Ayoub

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n11p143

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nino Kemertelidze  
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: María del Carmen Hernandez Cueto  
Universidad Autonoma de Nayarit, Mexico

### **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: Maria del Carmen Hernández Cueto	
University/Country: Universidad Autonoma de Nayarit	
Date Manuscript Received: March 4, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: March 12, 2025
Manuscript Title: Socioemotional Linguistic and Rhetorical Markers of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: Insights from Academics across Lebanese Universities	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 55 02 25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: yes, I agree	
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: I do	

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

**Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.**

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
Socioemotional Linguistic and Rhetorical Markers of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: Insights from Academics across Lebanese Universities. (it too long)	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
Several theoretical frameworks examine the intricate relationship between language and socioemotional dynamics. Drawing upon Fairclough's tripartite framework of critical discourse analysis, this research study case endeavors to	

show how linguistic expression encapsulates the socioemotional experiences of displacement, trauma, resilience, and solidarity among university faculty impacted by the airstrikes in Lebanon in 2024. This research main objective is to: scrutinizes the use of lexical choices and rhetorical strategies to articulate these emotions while reflecting social and ideological constructs in reaction to the prevailing hostilities. Object. Data were collected from the perspectives of sixty-two instructors and staff members across thirteen Lebanese universities through a twenty-item online survey, which served as the foundation for both statistical and descriptive analysis. Furthermore, as a result twenty-six online narrative reflection logs provided a linguistically nuanced representation of socioemotional linguistic indicators related to displacement, trauma, resilience, and solidarity, while also invoking rhetorical techniques such as similes, metaphors, hypophoras, epizeuxis, and anaphoras that signified a connection to a collective identity.	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	
<i>In introduction of first line</i> As of October 2024... change The last October line 10 had been killd, Line 16 By October 28, a sharp increase in extensive displacement had been recorded, reporting <b>In fourth paragraph line 6 and adaptive change by AN ADAPTIVE,</b> <b>In fourth paragraph line 7 Additonally ADD ,</b> <b>Fist paragraph of literature review add a comma Since, in the context of war, SAME PARAGRAPH one's thoughts and perspective on the world (Frothingham, 2023). Further, John Gumperz's</b> <b>Last line in paragraph 1 literature review shared an interest or activity with them.</b> <b>In Methology in second line invetsigate</b>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>They are explaines</b>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, They are</b>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> They are	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <b>Yes, They are</b>	

**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):**

**There few problems with an edition second review could be solved**

### **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: Nino Kemertelidze	
University/Country: Independent researcher / Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 16.02.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.02.2025
Manuscript Title: <b>Socioemotional Linguistic and Rhetorical Markers of the September 2024 Hostilities in Lebanon: Insights from Academics across Lebanese Universities</b>	
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.**

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
The title clearly conveys the subject matter, focusing on socioemotional linguistic and rhetorical markers related to the 2024 hostilities in Lebanon. It effectively highlights the study’s scope and academic relevance. However, the title is a bit lengthy and could be more concise while retaining clarity. The phrase “Insights from Academics across Lebanese Universities” might be streamlined.	

<p>Recommendations: Consider shortening the title while maintaining key elements. For example, “Socioemotional Linguistic Markers in the 2024 Lebanon Conflict: A Critical Discourse Analysis” could be a more concise alternative.</p>	
<b>2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The abstract effectively outlines the study’s objectives, methodology, and key findings. It provides a clear summary of the research focus, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative aspects.</p> <p>However, some sentences are redundant, and certain methodological details could be more concise. Additionally, while results are mentioned, they could be slightly more specific.</p> <p>Recommendations: Streamline the abstract by eliminating repetitive phrases and ensuring that the results section highlights the most significant findings concisely.</p>	
<b>3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<p>The article is generally well-written in an academic style, demonstrating strong command of terminology and structure.</p> <p>But there are some grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and spelling mistakes (e.g., embeded → embedded, invetsigate → investigate, refelect → reflect). These minor issues can affect readability.</p> <p>Recommendations: A thorough proofreading pass or professional editing would enhance clarity and correctness.</p>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The methodology section provides a clear explanation of the research design, data collection process (survey and narrative reflection logs), and analytical approach (Fairclough’s CDA framework). The inclusion of tables and figures enhances clarity.</p> <p>While the methods are well-explained, some details – such as participant selection criteria and potential biases – could be elaborated. The justification for certain methodological choices (e.g., sample size) is not always explicit.</p> <p>Recommendations: Clarify the rationale behind participant selection and discuss any limitations or potential biases in the methodology. A brief explanation of data triangulation (if applicable) could strengthen the credibility of the findings.</p>	
<b>5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The results are well-structured, clearly presented, and supported by tables and figures. The findings effectively highlight key emotional and linguistic markers, making the data easy to interpret. Statistical and qualitative analyses are well-integrated.</p> <p>While the results are generally clear, some explanations could be more concise. Certain sections slightly overlap with the discussion, making it harder to distinguish pure results from interpretation.</p> <p>Recommendations: Ensure a strict separation between results and discussion. Summarizing key findings more succinctly would enhance clarity. Double-check numerical data for consistency.</p>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings and aligns well with the study’s objectives. It reinforces the role of linguistic markers in expressing socioemotional responses and highlights the implications for sociolinguistics and discourse studies.</p>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>

The reference list is extensive, including a mix of theoretical and empirical sources relevant to the study. Key works on discourse analysis, linguistic markers, and socioemotional responses are well-represented. The citations follow a consistent academic format.

**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):**

This is an interesting paper. Please, put the finishing touches according to the recommendations.