



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Alice in Wonderland on Screen: A Feminist and Symbolic Analysis of Disney’s 1951 and Tim Burton’s 2010 Adaptations”

Submitted: 16 July 2023

Accepted: 26 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

Corresponding Author: Burcin Hasanoglu

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n23p13

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paola Clara Leotta
University of Catania, Italy

Reviewer 2: Nino Kemertelidze
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

Reviewer 3: Arburim Iseni
State University of Tetovo, Republic of Macedonia

Reviewer 4: Blinded

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

No grammatical errors and spelling mistakes

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study METHODS are explained moderately.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body of the paper is clear and no errors found.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

I checked and verified that each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and really excellent. It is straight to the point of the content of the article. The topic of the article is really very interesting. It goes without saying that Lewis Carroll's fantasy story Alice's Adventures in Wonderland is popular with both older and younger generations. The work often plays with logic. It is also an example of the "literary nonsense" genre. Literature and popular culture have been influenced by many of the characters in the work. Probably, the fact that the mentioned work has been reviewed by different researchers is not controversial. On behalf of the author of this paper, it should be said that the researcher was able to see and discuss the mentioned book from a completely different point of view, from a different perspective, and present it in a very original way. In particular, the author considered the research topic – analytical interpretation of Alice in Wonderland in a completely different aspect, namely comparing the classical version to movie adaptations of Walt Disney and Tim Burton; moreover, the author did it through a feminist perspective and symbolism. It's a well-known fact that Alice's Adventures in Wonderland is full of symbolism. The author did a good job of it.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract meets all major requirements. It succinctly and concisely but exhaustively renders what the article is about. While reading the abstract, a reader already realizes the fundamental issues described in the paper in detail.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The paper is written in good English.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study method is based on comparative analysis which I rather appreciate. The author compares Lewis Carroll's fantasy story Alice's Adventures in Wonderland to its movie adaptations of Walt Disney and Tim Burton, finding similarities and differences.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Concerning the architectonics of the paper, I would say that it is one whole story. I think it'd be better if the author somehow separates the introduction, main body, discussion, and conclusion, according to the requirements of ESJ. However, each paragraph is logically linked with another.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

In the conclusion, the author succinctly but exhaustively discusses what the findings of the study revealed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive and appropriate. The bibliography comprises contemporary research works which is very important. It includes 10 references, but it's quite enough for such type of research where the author's personal opinion is more important. The references are listed in alphabetic order.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think you have to continue the research and present similar papers. I believe it will be interesting if you conduct similar work analyzing different authors in a similar way making a comparative analysis.

Please, correct the minor inaccuracies according to my suggestions. See my comment in section 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes, the title is clear and understandable, and adequate to the content of the article. In the title, the word "through" should be in lowercase, as it is a preposition and should not be capitalized in the title case. Everything else appears to be in order, and the title looks clear and descriptive.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract gives a clear overview of the main topics covered in the paper. It introduces the subject matter, which is the comparison of two movie adaptations of "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" by Walt Disney (1951) and Tim Burton (2010) from a feminist perspective. It also mentions the specific objects (the two movie adaptations) and the main method of analysis (feminist perspective and symbolism) that will be used to examine the movies.

However, there is no specific mention of the results or findings of the analysis in the abstract. The abstract mainly provides a context and background for the paper, but it doesn't reveal any specific conclusions or outcomes that the analysis might have produced. To improve the abstract, it would be helpful to include a brief summary of the main results or key points that were found through the feminist perspective and symbolism analysis.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

There are some punctuation and formatting errors in the paper and a few spelling errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, the study method is clearly presented

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The errors are mentioned above.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

There doesn't seem to be a clear conclusion or summary section explicitly labeled. The article discusses the different interpretations of Alice in Wonderland in the movie adaptations by Walt Disney (1951) and Tim Burton (2010) through a feminist perspective and symbolism. It compares the characterization of Alice in both adaptations, highlighting her independence and strength in Tim Burton's version.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The writing introduces a list of references to acknowledge the sources and give credibility to the analysis. However, it appears to have some inconsistencies and incorrect formatting.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article is presented in a very good way. However, there are minor errors to be addressed.

Reviewer D:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

It is clear, but long. It may be cut into two sentences.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

There is not any abstract.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes, there are. In addition, some vocabulary should be revised.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

There is no reference to a method. The paper refers to a feminist perspective and is a sort of literature review.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The whole paper should be reorganized into paragraphs.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

A conclusion should be clearly outlined.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The majority of References are not cited in the text (Bauer, and Lowne, Cathy, Friedman, et al., Ismajloska, Prorokova, Rappaport, Sabbarwal).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The paper is rich in content, but poor from a methodological point of view. It should be organized into paragraphs and should clearly present a method of analysis that refers to previous critical literature. Some language revision is also needed. In addition, all references should be cited in the body of the paper.