Corresponding Author: Laszlo Berenyi

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ⦿ 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ◉ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4

- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ⦿ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Positive aspects
The manuscript is interesting; it addresses a topic of major interest at this time as well.
The starting idea is challenging and is investigated with a validated method. The results and the discussion are worthwhile.
A negative aspect
This manuscript does not contain a "Future research" section.
The authors are asked to think about this aspect and if they intend to continue the investigation of some of the aspects considered, then to complete the manuscript with such a section.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ`s website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- ⦿ 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

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

```

```

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

[text box]

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ● 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ⦿ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ⦿ 3
- ○ 4

- ○ 5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ⦿ 4
- ○ 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- ○ Accepted, no revision needed
- ⦿ Accepted, minor revision needed
- ○ Return for major revision and resubmission
- ○ Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

My suggestion for the authors is minor revision. I encourage them to strengthen some parts of the paper as literature review, method and conclusions before the publication. I give them precise feedback.