



Paper: “Echoes of Silence: Postcolonial Feminist Voices in Hosseini’s And The Mountains Echoed”

Submitted: 14 August 2025

Accepted: 24 September 2025

Published: 30 September 2025

Corresponding Author: Chaker Abas

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n26p66

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Michele Russo
University of Catanzaro, Italy

Reviewer 2: Rana Al-Husseini
Beirut Arab University (BAU), Lebanon

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: Rana Al-Husseini	
University/Country: Beirut Arab University / Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: September 1, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: September 8, 2025
Manuscript Title: Echoes of Silence: Postcolonial Feminist Voices in Hosseini's And The Mountains Echoed	
ESJ Manuscript Number: --06—61.08.2025	
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.	5
<i>The title clearly captures the approach of the work under examination with a hint at the aim.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	4
<i>The abstract follows a concise and structured format. It clearly states the purpose, work under study, adopted approach or methodology, and main argument.</i>	
<i>The author can add one/two short sentences that summarize the findings and contributions of the study.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3

<i>Generally, the language is clear and direct. However. Some revisions should be made to check commas (like when writing 'but also' in the middle of the sentence), subject-verb agreement (like reflect after guilt), word choice (like vehicle), and spelling (like straight). Other errors can be highlighted upon in-depth revision of the article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>While the author highlights the main references of his theoretical, interpretative approach, mentioning C. T. Mohanty, G. C. Spivak, and D. Kandiyoti, there is no elaborate and thorough analysis of the thinkers' approaches or foundational ideas.</i>	
<i>The author should devote more attention to the methodology section by adding at least 1 or 2 quotes from every thinker and highlighting what their approach states in relation to postcolonial feminism. If this is not properly and clearly stated, readers would fail to understand the subsequent sections and relate to the theory.</i>	
<i>The methodology should include succinct and extensive ideas from the three mentioned thinkers rather than a list of ideas that are very broad and unrelated. Besides, while the abstract mentions that "Drawing on the works of C. T. Mohanty, G. C. Spivak, and D. Kandiyoti, the study explores the interplay between patriarchal structures, cultural memory, and geopolitical displacement," only one of these thinkers is mentioned very briefly in the methods sections, without outlining what Mohanty says. For example, the author can elaborate on these publications by the mentioned thinkers: Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity (2003) by Mohanty; "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) by Spivak; and "Bargaining with Patriarchy" (1988) by Kandiyoti. Any other references could be helpful to make the methodology richer and more extensive.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The author has extensively and meticulously provided a postcolonial feminist reading of the selected novel. There are quotations from the novel with commentaries, either personally interpreting ideas or referring to thinkers' works. This has made this section richer, mainly with the division of the discussion with subtitles to make it easy for readers to comprehend various ideas in an ordered manner.</i>	
<i>Some quotes like Abdoll should be cited with page numbers.</i>	
<i>A simple recommendation is to select the most recognized and significant thinkers and scholars mentioned in the results and discussion section and include them in the methods section to make the application become more explicit and clearer. Moreover, the limitations and contributions could have been included in the conclusion at the end rather than the discussion section.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusion is direct, clear, and accurate. It summarizes the main findings of the study, re-mentions the methodology adopted, and provides further insights for enlightenment.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references apparently follow the APA 7th edition. However, some minor revisions should be made. Some references should be revised like the first one in which the title of the work is</i>	

italicized, yet the journal name with the volume number should only be italicized. The volume number should be also italicized in the 3rd reference.

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):

More attention should be devoted to the methods section; otherwise, the paper would be missing in terms of its relevance, applicability, implications, and contributions.