



Paper: “Discrimination Against Vulnerable Groups in Exercising Their Voting Rights Due to Systemic Flaws in the Macedonian Electoral Legislation”

Corresponding Author: Jelena Ristic

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n23p10

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Sandra Brožová
University of Economics in Prague, the Czech Republic

Reviewer 2: Olga Koshevaliska
University Goce Delcev, Stip, Macedonia

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Published: 31.08.2020

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: Olga Koshevaliska	
University/Country: University Goce Delcev, Stip, North Macedonia	
Date Manuscript Received: 18/07/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 22/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Discrimination against vulnerable groups in exercising their voting rights	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 89.07.2020	
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
The title is clear and relevant to the content of the article, and the topic is on a extremely ongoing issue in the Republic of North Macedonia.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5

The abstract presents the main subject of the article for the discrimination of vulnerable groups in the exercising their voting rights in a manner to problematize it and make it disputable. The author also gives a short insight to the results of the research.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
There are no spelling nor grammatical errors in the article.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
Even though the study methods are not presented in a implicit form, it is clear that the author used comparative method, the legal method and analyze.	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
The body of the paper is structured well, has a good context and is clear and convincing to the hypotheses of the author.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
In the conclusion the author gives its final remarks that are a product of the article. The author carefully explains and addresses to every question that arose from the main subject.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
The references are appropriate, the author links every information to the appropriate source and gives a comprehensive information about the source.	

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):

No comment.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I suggest that you publish this article without further interventions in the text.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

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.
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: 18 July 2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 20 July 2020
Manuscript Title: Discrimination Against Vulnerable Groups in Exercising Their Voting Rights	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0789/20	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No 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.	3
The article is focused solely on the situation in the Republic of North Macedonia, so it is recommended to change the title of the article so that the content is clearer for readers. The current title is able to induce expectations of a more comprehensive or comparative study on the topic.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<p>The abstract is rather a logical summary of the content of the article. The methods are not elaborated in the abstract neither anywhere else in the article. Apparently, the description and analysis are mainly used as methods. The results presented in the conclusion in the paper are not much different from information mentioned right at the outset as a starting point of research.</p>	
<p>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The article is written in correct and well understandable English. However, additional proofreading is recommended, there are some spelling mistakes, not numerous, as well as repeating the same words.</p>	
<p>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Same as Question 2. - The methods are not elaborated in the abstract neither anywhere else in the article. Apparently, the description and analysis are mainly used as methods.</p>	
<p>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The article is completely clear and does not contain any errors (except some few spelling mistakes).</p>	
<p>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The conclusion is only descriptive and it summarizes the main findings stated at the beginning and in the main part of the article. These findings are expressed accurately and are firmly supported by presented citations and paraphrases of the legislative texts and specialized reports.</p>	
<p>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>The author uses a wide array of sources, both academic writings and reports elaborated by specialized international organizations. The references are accurate, they contain also the exact page or pages which increases reliability and enables the reader to consult original sources.</p>	

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):

The reviewed article covers a very interesting, recent and also specialized topic that is being frequently discussed by human rights experts and touches everyday life of all of us as active citizens. The article features logical structure, deep knowledge of the author and reliable sources. However, the weakness of the article is its prevalent descriptive style. The majority of the paper is devoted to the description of the domestic electoral law and relevant international documents. The conclusions of the article do not go beyond the summary of previously mentioned facts. It is recommended to improve the added value of the content for future readers. There are several ways to apply further research:

- e.g. to elaborate some concrete recommendations how to amend the legislation currently in force
- e.g. to prepare a comparative study embracing other country/-ies in the region
- e.g. to rewrite the part “Relevant legal framework” in such a way that is not describing national and international sources separately but is discussing the same questions concurrently with reference to both types of legal sources, it would enable the author to evaluate the level of compatibility of the Macedonian legal order with international commitments

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this paper.