



**Paper: “Assessing Key Business-related Indicators for Smart Cities: Case of Tbilisi City”**

Corresponding Author: Tamar Khakhishvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p15](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n22p15)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Paul Waithaka  
Kenyatta University, Kenya

Reviewer 2: Anna Zelenkova  
Matej Bel University, Slovakia

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: Paul Waithaka	
University/Country: Kenyatta University/Kenya	
Date Manuscript Received: 01/10/2020	Date Review Report Submitted: 13/07/2020
Manuscript Title: Assessing Key Business-related Indicators for Smart Cities: Case of Tbilisi City	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 06107/20	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>	<b>4</b>

<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
Some paragraphs are too long. Break them appropriately	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>3</b>
The author needs to bring out the conclusions of the paper much more clearly	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>3</b>
There is need to ensure that the reference list is uniform. Some of the referenced work are entire in capital letters while others are in small letters	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>X</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

# ***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:	Date Review Report Submitted: 12 July 2020
<b>Manuscript Title: Assessing Key Business-related Indicators for Smart Cities: Case of Tbilisi City</b>	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 107.06.2020	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <u>Yes/No</u>	
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]
<b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>results.</b>	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Some minor mistakes are indicated (but not all as I am not the editor of the text) – please improve the use of articles in some cases; otherwise no serious mistakes, the article is well written.</i>	
<b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>As mentioned in point 3.</i>	
<b>6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
<b>7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Unification is needed in giving the titles of some resources (capitalization is not needed).</i>	

**Overall Recommendation**(mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	<b>x</b>
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

The article is well written, the methodology properly used and described in order to reach the intended results. Smaller changes are needed in the use of articles (many times missing), punctuation and unification of references. I recommend the article to be published in the ESJ.

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**