



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Shaping Saudi Arabia’s National Image Under Vision 2030: An Appraisal Analysis of the Saudi Minister of Tourism's Davos Discourse”

Submitted: 22 July 2026

Accepted: 15 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Fawzi Ali Alshammari

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n23p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Nawal Ayoub
Lebanese University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Nora Islam
Bangladesh Maritime University, Bangladesh

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: 20July 2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 6 August 2026
Manuscript Title: Shaping Saudi Arabia's National Image Under Vision 2030: An Appraisal Analysis of the Saudi Minister of Tourism's Davos Discourse	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree that 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.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear, and it is adequate for the content of the article.	5
(Please insert your comments)	

<i>The title is descriptive, clear, and accurately highlights the main subject, analytical framework (Appraisal Analysis), target data (Minister of Tourism's Davos discourse), and context (Saudi Arabia's Vision 2030).</i>	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract is concise and it clearly presents the primary research goal, the theoretical framework (Appraisal Theory / Attitude system), methodology (qualitative single-case design), and the main findings. It could be enhanced a bit by briefly mentioning the specific sample size/data length (a 17-minute transcript with 53 evaluative tokens) for extra clarity.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The paper is understandable in general, but there are minor typos, missing words, and formatting issues throughout the text. Hence I suggest the text requires proofreading. A few examples to help the author: In Section 2.2: "The present hopes to examines..." should be corrected to "The present study aims to examine..." In Section 3.3: Reference coding rules note has an unfinished parenthesis: "...rules of Martin and White (2005, pp. The words 'must'..." In Section 4 (Table 1 section): In the table description and table headings, Table 2 is listed twice (once under Judgement and once under Appreciation). Typos such as "show the Saudi Arabia as an able..." in the Abstract. Etc.....	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The application of Appraisal Theory (specifically the Attitude subsystem: Affect, Judgement, Appreciation) and Evaluative Coupling is methodologically sound and well-explained. The data collection process is explicit. However, the author has mentioned a second coder checked consistency in Section 3.3; reporting an inter-coder reliability metric (e.g., Cohen's kappa or percentage agreement) would strengthen the methodological rigor.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4

(Please insert your comments)

The numerical breakdown and percentage data are logically presented across the tables and supported by qualitative interpretations. However, there are minor labeling errors in the table numbering, such as:

— **Table 2 is duplicated in title labeling (Section 4.1 has "Table 2 Frequency of Appreciation Resources"**

— **Section 4.2 also has "Table 2 Frequency of Judgement Resources").**

— **Section 4.2 should be renumbered to Table 3.**

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.

5

(Please insert your comments)

The conclusions logically follow from the findings. The author successfully connects the linguistic findings back to broader implications, by demonstrating how political-economic tourism discourse differs from standard consumer-promotional tourism genres by incorporating a significant degree of Judgement (Social Esteem).

Limitations and future research directions are also appropriately noted.

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

5

(Please insert your comments)

The literature cited is appropriate, relevant, and well-integrated into both Systemic Functional Linguistics / Appraisal Theory and national image/branding contexts. Reference of a very recent scholarship keeps the study timely and well-grounded.

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):

1. **Table Labeling & Renumbering:** Please correct the table captions in Section 4. The caption for Judgement resources is currently titled "Table 2", which duplicates the caption for Appreciation resources. Renumber the Judgement table to Table 3 and verify all subsequent table call-outs in the body text.
2. **Methodological Precision (Inter-coder Reliability):** Since a second coder was involved to check consistency, explicitly state the percentage agreement or inter-coder reliability rate achieved to bolster the qualitative design.
3. **Incomplete Sentences & Typos:** Perform a comprehensive proofreading pass to fix minor typographical errors and truncated parenthetical references (e.g., Section 2.2 "*The present hopes to examines*", Section 3.3 page citations for Martin & White).

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2026

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 a peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived 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 with 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: Nora Islam	
University, Country: Bangladesh Maritime University, Bangladesh	
Date Manuscript Received: 27/07/2026	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/08/2026
Manuscript Title: Shaping Saudi Arabia's National Image Under Vision 2030: An Appraisal Analysis of the Saudi Minister of Tourism's Davos Discours	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0816/26	
You agree that 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:	

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 for the content of the article.	4
The title provides a clear explanation of the content.	
2. The abstract presents objectives, methods, and results.	4
The abstract is constructive and well informative.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
no Grammatical errors	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
It provides a clear explanation that is relevant to the study.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The paper's body is coherent and flowing but more discussion needed to make it straight and understandable.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
Yes, the conclusions are well supported	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
References are inadequate. Author should add some more relevant references.	

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):