EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

Paper: "International Students Attraction and Retention Practices at Georgian Higher Education Institutions"

YEARS

Submitted: 28 February 2022 Accepted: 29 April 2022 Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Ekaterine Kvantaliani

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2022.v18n13p55

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: N. K. Rathee Delaware State University, USA

Reviewer 2: Grazia Angeloni University "G. d'Annunzio", Italy

Reviewer 3: Jelena Zascerinska University of Latvia, Latvia

Reviewer 4: Jingshun Zhang Florida Gulf Coast University, USA Reviewer A: Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

The title is clear and adequate to the content of the article.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract is clear and well-written.

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

There are no grammatical errors and mistakes in the article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are clearly explained.

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

The paper is well-organized and thought-provoking.

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

The conclusions are accurate and address the research questions.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The references are comprehensive and appropriate.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer B: Recommendation: Accept Submission

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

Yes, the title of the paper concisely conveys the purpose of this study.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

Abstract has all the required components to provide the reader with an overview of the study.

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

Very few grammatical errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methodology of the paper is quite descriptive and explains the process.

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

The body of the paper is very cohesive and maintains a smooth flow of the narrative.

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

The author has very precisely drawn the conclusions

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The research cited in the study has been duly supported by the references.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, no revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C: Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title is lear and coherent with the issue

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract introduces objects, approach and results of the investigation

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

the language is plain and correct

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

the Grounded theory approach and the qualitative methodology used seem to fit the purpose, even if a quantitative analysis led on by some software e.g. T-LAB applied to the participants' interviews would have endowed the contents discussed with a higher analytical rigour

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

the body of the paper is coherent with the analysis categories at the basis of the investigation

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

The conclusions are quite accurate even if they could be more detailed by analyzing the participants'response on the basis of the occurrences, co-occurrences in the speech and the chi-square function

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

the bibliography can absolutely be expanded with reference texts on Grounded theory and interviews. International sociological research provides excellent insights

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Extend the methodology to quantitative analysis; widen references.

Reviewer G:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title of the submitted paper reflects the content of the article and is well-formulated.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract describes objects and methods. However, the results of the research are not presented in the abstract.

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

The article contains some misprints, grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. For example, on Page 5 and 6, "....data was..." while data are plural. Some articles are missed. On page 7, the sentence "...Keystone... students to partner to university;;;" requires reformulation. On Page 22, "All these activities improve th..." while it should be "the"? The abbreviations as GPA on Page 25 could be explained.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The study methods are briefly presented. The choice of the methods is adequately explained.

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

The body of the article is well structured. It is also written in a good style. On page 12, Table is not entitled and is not referred in the text of the article.

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

The conclusions are mostly built of the research findings. However, what refers to internal and external factors, the factor appear only in the conclusions, and their connection to the codes is not clarified. Further research work in this field is not indicated, too.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of literature is a good illustration of current work done in the research field in the 21st century. However, on Page 3, the cited work of McChesney 2013 does not appear in the list of references. On Page 4, the citation should be shown in this way: (Yan, 2017; Zhavnia, 2016).

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Thanks to the author(s) for the timely discussion of the research topic important to many involved in higher education!

Reviewer H: Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

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

It is clear. However not strong

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

It is OK. However, there are some missed information and need to revise

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

1. Yes, need to improve

2. Need professional editor in English to help

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

OK However, some are not clear

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

It has many good ideas. However, need to revise

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

It is good

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Not clear! Need to follow one unique writing style e.g. APA

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This article has many good ideas. However, it needs to be revise a lot

- 1- Clarify sentences .
- 2- Avoid to use long sentences
- 3- Show more in some points in details
- 4. Get help from professional English Editor

Reviewer K:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

The title responds to the context of the article, i. the activities of the higher school, organized by five higher education institutions, are discussed.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract of the article presents the parameters of the research, but the object of the research could be presented more clearly.

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

The article uses the correct language.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods used in the article are explained and presented clearly.

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

The context of the article is clear.

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

The findings are widely presented and in some cases lead to results and discussion. I think the conclusions should be more specific and conceptual. The findings should also be related to the purpose of the article and the results found.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

It is recommended to review the sources presentation. Some sources are not in accordance with APA requirements.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The article can be published with the proposed improvements.
