

Paper: **“Legal Governing of e-contracts in Georgian Legislation”**

Submitted: 30 July 2020

Accepted: 14 January 2021

Published: 31 January 2021

Corresponding Author: Tea Edisherashvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n2p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Stefan Vladutescu
University of Craiova, Romania

Reviewer 2: Robert N. Diotalevi
Florida Gulf Coast University, USA

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: Dr. Robert Diotalevi, Esq.	
University/Country: FGCU, USA	
Date Manuscript Received: 9/21/20	Date Review Submitted: 9/21/20
Report	
Manuscript Title: Legal governing of e-contracts in Georgian legislation	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
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>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

Very well written with relevant, up-to-date materials and solid cited sources. Fine work here.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Reviewers Guide

PART A:

SECTION I

Reviewer's Name:	Stefan Vladutescu
E-Mail:	
Manuscript Number:	ESJ 48.08.2020
Title:	Legal governing of e-contracts in Georgian legislation
Authors:	Tea Edisherashvili, PhD undergraduate at GrigolRobakidze University, Assistant to Professor at GrigolRobakidze University, Head of Legal Provision and Labor Safety Administration at LEPL National Statistics Service of Georgia
Date Sent To Reviewer:	23.09.2020
Date Expected From Reviewer:	

PART B: *Reviewer Only*

SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	This manuscript investigates an interesting topic.
Introduction:	<u>The introduction does not exploit current knowledge fund from 2020.</u> <u>In the introduction a literature review must be carried out.</u>

Methodology:	The methodology is adapted to the theme.
Results:	The results obtained are valid and verifiable.
Discussion:	The discussions are applied to the subject.

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:	Are missing references from 2020.
Others:	
Decision:	This manuscript requires minor corrections.

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality:	2
Contribution To The Field:	2
Technical Quality:	3
Clarity Of Presentation :	2
Depth Of Research:	3

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)

Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	X
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	

SECTION V: Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):

Manuscript requires minor revision.