

Paper: “The International Aspects of the Smuggling of Migrants Across State Borders and the Fight Against it”

Submitted: 26 July 2021

Accepted: 14 June 2022

Published: 30 June 2022

Corresponding Author: Mamuka Egutidze

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p82](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n20p82)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Marie Line Karam
Lebanese University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Camilla Buzzacchi
University Milano Bicocca, Italy

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: Dr Marie line Karam	
University/Country: Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: August 21th, 2021	Date Review Report Submitted: August 23 rd , 2021
Manuscript Title: The international aspects of the smuggling of migrants across state borders and the fight against it	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Ye	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Ye	
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.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
The methodology is analytical and descriptive, however the author did not go further in his ideas despite the fact that he had very important vision	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
Important references are missing especially the basic references	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

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

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The author discussed a very important and strategic topic .I would recommend to go further and to propose remedies . Moreover, the scientific method : legal problem , analysis and conclusion must be respected . I was so excited to read this article . Finally , the basic references in International law must be included .

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

Very important topic . Please encourage such subjects

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

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: Camilla Buzzacchi	
University/Country: Università Milano Bicocca - Italy	
Date Manuscript Received: 28 July	Date Review Report Submitted: 4 August
Manuscript Title: The international aspects of the smuggling of migrants across state borders and the fight against it	
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.	4
The title is coherent with the content.	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
The abstract correctly summarizes the essay.	

3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
The language is quite good.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
There is a very short description of the multi-discipline method.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
The results are clear.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
The conclusions are clear.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	1
The references are quite confused, mixing law and doctrine	

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):

There is a strange way to use footnotes: they cannot be recognized in the text.

They seem to be mixed with the references. The Author should separate footnotes from references; and in the references, codes and conventions should be separated from literature.