

Review Form 3

Book Name:	Current Progress in Arts and Social Studies Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3898
Title of the Manuscript:	Harald Moltke, Outstanding painter of the Aurora
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript’s importance to the scientific community lies in its indepth historical coverage of Aurora studies. Aurora enthusiasts or sky gazers would also find this work useful. The work projects the merits of interdisciplinary and collaborative work between science and art. Art histrians would find this work useful.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of this work could be more lively than it is currently. Examples; “The Aurora’s Masterful Depiction: Harald Moltke’s Artistic Legacy” or “Northern Lights, Southern Brush: Harald Moltke's Artistic Odyssey”	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is essentially adequate, except that certain extentions are needless and could therefore be contracted for economy of words. Example; “has been” in the first line can change to “is” and “who was leading” can change to “who led”.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is mainly a historical account that involved scientific and artistic outputs. Considering the title, one might expect the writer to dwell more on the works of Harald Moltke. However, contextualising these art works, under the circumstances also demanded that these other areas be covered in order to do justice to the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are sufficient. The writer has a fundamental reference and a general reference. The author did not have much recent publications to deal with, on account of the historical nature of the content. The reference is sufficient nonetheless.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the English quality is suitable for scholarly communication. Just a few typographical errors to be taken care of.	
Optional/General comments	The point of view or narrative voice is not consistent to the end. I want to trust that the author does it consciously for desired effect and not unintentionally.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Antwi
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana