

Paper: “**Cultural Tourism in Georgia: Opportunities at Global and Local Levels**”

Submitted: 16 October 2020

Accepted: 01 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Nino Sachaleli

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n34p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Yeboah Evans

Nanjing University of Science and Technology, China

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:	Email:
University/Country:	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 21/10/2020
Manuscript Title: Cultural Tourism in Georgia: Opportunities on Global and Local Levels	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1105/20	

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.	5
<i>(The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article. However, a brief explanation is recommendable)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(objects and methods are clear but not the results)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(There are minor grammatical errors and spelling mistakes which needs to be corrected)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Methods should be further clarified and clearly differentiate from the main body)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(The body is clear but contains minor errors which need to be corrected)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(The conclusions should be further developed)</i>	

7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are sufficient but there is a different language within them which need to be cross-check)</i>	

Overall Recommendation(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

To assist the author(s) in revising his/her/their manuscript, please separate your remarks into two sections:

(1) Suggestions, which would improve the quality of the paper but are not essential for publication.

(2) Changes which must be made before publication

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: