

**Paper: “Assessing the Need for Ecotourism Cluster Establishment in Georgia:
Ways to Increase the Country’s Competitiveness”**

Submitted: 11 June 2020

Accepted: 23 November 2020

Published: 30 November 2020

Corresponding Author: Tamar Khakhishvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2020.v16n31p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Yeboah Evans

Nanjing University of Science and Technology, China

Reviewer 2: Blinded

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: 24/06/2020 | Date Review Report Submitted: 28/06/2020 |
| Manuscript Title: Assessing the Need for Ecotourism Cluster Establishment in Georgia: Way to increase country Competitiveness | |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 0697/20 | |
| You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No | |
| You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 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>(A brief explanation is recommendable)</i> | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| | |
| 2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results. | 4 |
| <i>(objective and results are clear but not the methods)</i> | |
| 3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article. | 4 |
| <i>(There are some grammatical errors and punctuations which needs to be corrected.)</i> | |
| 4. The study methods are explained clearly. | 3 |
| <i>(Methods should be further clarified)</i> | |
| 5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors. | 4 |
| <i>(The body is clear but there are some minor errors to be corrected. The choice of colors for figures 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8,9,10,11, and 12 need to be adjusted because they are not very readable.)</i> | |
| 6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content. | 3 |
| <i>(The conclusion needs to be distinguished from the results. There should be a further clarification between the conclusion and results.)</i> | |
| 7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate. | 4 |
| <i>(The references style and sources should be well cited)</i> | |

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):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: