

Paper: “Challenges for Western Balkan Countries Regional Integration: the Case of North Macedonia”

Submitted: 27 April 2022

Accepted: 27 June 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Katerina Tosevska

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p23](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p23)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ivana Popović Petrović
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics, Serbia

Reviewer 2: Okyay Uçan
Nigde Omer Halisdemir University, Turkey

Reviewer 3: Predrag Bjelić
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics, Serbia

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: OKYAY UÇAN	
University/Country: NİĞDE OMER HALISDEMİR UNIVERSITY- TURKEY	
Date Manuscript Received: 02.05.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 06.05.2022
Manuscript Title: Challenges for Western Balkan Countries Regional Integration	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0521/22	
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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>I checked by grammerly and found lots of mistakes. This may be corrected by proofreading.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<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.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</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):

- There are lots of spelling mistakes.
- The abstract part is too long. You have to give the aim, originality and covering shortly.
- Covering period is 2005-2020 so it is 16 years but authors said that it was fifteen.
- It may be better to give a summary table for the literature.

-For Table 1, it is better to give dependent variable also there.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

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: Predrag Bjelić	
University/Country: University of Belgrade, Faculty of Economics, Serbia	
Date Manuscript Received: 29.04.2022.	Date Review Report Submitted: 04.05.2022.
Manuscript Title: Challenges for Western Balkan Countries Regional Integration	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0521/22	
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.	4

The econometric analysis in the paper includes only North Macedonia trade flows so this should reflect in the title, like subtitle.	
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.	4
Spelling mistake on page 3 “CEFTA -2006 fell betweeen 10-15%” and others.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
The use of the gravity model in this paper is adequate since this method is highly relevant for field of international trade. The results are confirmed in the literature.	
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.	4
The references are appropriate but not all articles are included in the literature review which deal with this subject.	

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 econometric analysis in the paper includes only North Macedonia trade flows so this should reflect in the title, like subtitle.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: