



REVIEW HISTORY

Paper: "Freedom as the Antithesis of Commitment in Jean-Paul Sartre's *The Flies (Les Mouches)*"

Corresponding Author: Wafaa A. Mostafa Hussein

Email: wafaanagy@yahoo.com

Doi: 10.19044/llc.v8no2a1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tamari Dolidze
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

Reviewer 2: Fatima – Zohra Iflahen
University of Cadi Ayyad, Morocco

Published: 30.06.2021





LLC Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: LLC 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.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 9/03/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 16/03/2021
Manuscript Title: Freedom as the Antithesis of Commitment in Jean-Paul Sartre's <i>The Flies (Les Mouches)</i>	
Manuscript Number: n/a	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	





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 is clear and definitely relevant to the content of the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Abstract requires adding methods and results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>N/a</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Study methods require formulation and further explanations.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>n/a</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content, though would be good to be expanded as summary is not separated from the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</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):

I would kindly advise re-developing of the abstract, which t requires adding methods and results, also adding study methods and clearer explanation and further expansion of the conclusions and summary part.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I would kindly advise you to allow the author make the above-mentioned small modifications.





LLC Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: LLC 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.

LLC editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands LLC out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: March 9th	Date Review Report Submitted: March 29th
Manuscript Title: Freedom as the Antithesis of Commitment in Jean Paul Sartres' The Flies (Les MOuches)	
Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	





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.	4
<i>The title actually sets the premise of the paper and clearly states the two key ideas that will be tackled in the article; i.e. that there is a paradox in claiming that freedom is a possible corollary of commitment. Commitment, in other words, can only be alienating and isolating.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>It seems the paper focuses more on the second part of the abstract, which consists in analyzing Sartres' concept of freedom and commitment. If the paper indeed mentions the ties between the play's protagonists with their antique counterparts, how the Greek myth is embedded in the modern dram is only superficially addressed in our opinion.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>These are so few they might go unnoticeable.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>To a certain extent only. The author does not actually share their intentions with the readers who have to get to discover what is meant as they go over the paper. The method is announced to want to appeal to multiple fields of study. However, it seems very much descriptive of the similarities and differences between the Greek and the Modern plays.</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>The body of the paper is very well written. It is concise, balanced and is free of spelling, grammar or language mistakes. The overall structure makes it easy to read and understand.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<i>For a sixteen-page paper, it is quite frustrating the conclusion only very succinctly summarizes the article and restates its main thesis.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3.5





The references are relevant. However, only two are less than 5 years old. Many, on the contrary, are quite old.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

