

Paper: “The Impact of Foreign Direct Investment on the Economic Growth of South Caucasus Countries”

Submitted: 27 May 2021

Accepted: 15 October 2021

Published: 31 October 2021

Corresponding Author: Lela Schöler-Iordanashvili

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p38](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n35p38)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Kazimierz Albin Klosinski
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

Reviewer 4: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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:06/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 06/07/2021
Manuscript Title: The Impact of foreign direct investment on the Economic Growth of South Caucasus countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0626/21	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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>(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.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

When this study examined in terms of quantitative methods, it is very basic due to its methodology and can only be a conference paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

When this study examined in terms of quantitative methods, it is very basic due to its methodology and can only be a conference paper.

This article/ paper could be sent a different reviewer working in the field of Economics and a different opinion can be obtained.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: Kazimierz Kłosiński	Email:
University/Country: The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland	
Date Manuscript Received: 13 VII 2021 y.	Date Review Report Submitted: 15 VII 2021 y.
Manuscript Title: The Impact of foreign direct investment on the Economic Growth of South Caucasus Countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0626/21	
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>Yes, it is clear and adequate</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>Sufficiently</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3,5
<i>Side 3, Perpendicular co-ordinate – you should give the meaning of “E”; side 7, the equation “lnGrowth” requires corrections; side 8, table 4, two stars – “**” – in [lnFDI-to-GDP, 1] explanations require, side 9, table 4 – you should give the meaning of “C”.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>They are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Sufficiently</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions are accurate.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The literature hugs 27 position – comprehensive and appropriate.</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:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 13/07/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 15/07/2021
Manuscript Title: The Impact of foreign direct investment on the Economic Growth of South Caucasus countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
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>Yes, the title is clear.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>Yes. The abstract consider all these elements. Probably, I would enforce better the results section of the abstract.</i> <i>Probably, in the introduction, more references are needed to legitimate the analysis. Here, I would encourage you to give a more precise idea of what kind of GAP the paper aims to address.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>No, the style and grammar are good.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>The methodology should be better developed included a theoretical part on why the quantitative method fits this analysis. You may see, for example:</i> https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1971 https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3835696	
5. The results are precise and do not contain errors.	
<i>The results are exciting and engaging.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The conclusion is interesting. However, I would encourage a reformulation of it.</i> <i>Mainly, you should start with:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Background of the paper (What move your research idea to study this field);</i> • <i>Give the main results obtained discussing them considering the literature that you cite in the previous section;</i> • <i>Main theoretical and practical implications;</i> • <i>Limitations and future research perspectives.</i> 	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> <i>Yes, I would encourage more references in the introduction and methodology section.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for significant revision and resubmission	
Reject	

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

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: 02.09.2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 13.09.2021
Manuscript Title: The Impact of foreign direct investment on the Economic Growth of South Caucasus countries	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0626/21	
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>The title is clear and it is well related with the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4

<i>The abstract gives shortly the overall purpose of the study, the methodology and the main finding from data analysis.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>The paper needs proofreading and to be formatted correctly.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The study method is clearly explained.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>The result given from the data analysis contradicts what the author declares or cites in the literature review.</i>	
<i>The statistical data in the regression part are not significant to continue analyzing the factors which impact FDI of these countries.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>The conclusions are supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>The references need to be written in the text body according the rules of citation.</i>	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: