

Paper: “Challenges of the 21st Century in European Continent: Terrorism and Migration”

Submitted: 29 January 2022

Accepted: 01 May 2022

Published: 31 May 2022

Corresponding Author: Maria Bordas

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n16p67](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n16p67)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elena Temelkovska-Anevskaa

Faculty of Law, University “St. Kliment Ohridski”- Bitola, Macedonia

Reviewer 2: Emeka C. Ekeke

University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria

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 title of the manuscript is too bogus. The authors need to narrow it down

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Not at all. The method is not clearly stated. The authors should clearly state the methods. The objectives are there.

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

(Please insert your comments)

The authors did a good job. However, they proofread their work to correct any hanging sentence and spelling errors.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The authors did not clearly state the method.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The work is a good paper that deals with two major cancer-worms plaguing Europe and other parts of the world. It is properly written and deserves to be published.

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

*

(Please insert your comments)

The authors captured the summation of the paper properly.

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)

The author used footnote and did it appropriately

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):

The authors should rewrite the abstract and carefully include the method and objective of the paper.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

This paper should be accepted after the author has made the necessary correction.