

Paper: **“Third Parties without Independent Claims in Civil Proceedings”**

Submitted: 13 May 2022

Accepted: 10 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Zurab Morchadze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p128](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p128)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Valerian Khrustali
Grigol Robakidze University/Georgia

Reviewer 2: Roxana Matefi
Transilvania University of Brasov, Romania

Reviewer 3: Sergi Jorbenadze
Grigol Robakidze University, Georgia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Valerian Khrustali	
University/Country: Grigol Robakidze University/Georgia	
Date Manuscript Received: 16/05/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 17/05/22
Manuscript Title: Third parties without independent claims in civil proceedings	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0544/22	
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
<i>Excellent title</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>The text perfectly conveys the subject of the article, the goals, and the expected results.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Good text, without any grammatical or spelling mistakes.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>Yes</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>The results of the article are clearly derived from the main aims of the article</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusion of the article summarizes the results of the research briefly and specifically.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references used in the article are sufficient quantity and with appropriate accuracy</i>	

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:
I find this article suitable for publication.**