

Paper: “Identity - an Influential Factor in Modernization of Healthcare Systems in Hungary and Serbia”

Submitted: 13 July 2022

Accepted: 28 July 2022

Published: 31 July 2022

Corresponding Author: Aleksandra Varga-Kocsicska

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p312](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n22p312)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Ricardo Furfaro
University of Business & Social Sciences, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Arlinda Ymeraj
Luarasi University, Albania

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: Arlinda Ymeraj	
University/Country: Luarasi University, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 18 June	Date Review Report Submitted: 24 June
Manuscript Title: Identity and skepticism – influential factors in modernization of healthcare systems in Hungary and Serbia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 43.06.2022	
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.	3

<i>The title is clear and adequate, although evidence does not support the role of identity and skepticism vis-à-vis modernization of healthcare management.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1
<i>The abstract does not present clearly any of the above elements.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>Very few grammatical errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	1
<i>The study method is explained, but it is not pertinent to the study object.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
<i>The results are not clear, because there is no logical framework for the study, no indicators, no findings supported by evidence.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	2
<i>The conclusions are formulated in a clear manner but they are not supported by the evidence.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate, but it is not clear how they are used to establish research framework. They are used only for theoretical analysis purpose, which is not integrated to the study object.</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 type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors have to seriously revise the methodology and research framework by formulating the main purpose, the main research questions associated with the core hypothesis. Then, they have to explain how they are going to prove or to disapprove the core thesis by bringing pertinent evidence, either by primary or by secondary sources of information. Their findings have to be backed by the data elaboration and analysis, leading to the formulation of conclusions.

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!

Date Manuscript Received: 15.07.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 19.07.2022
Manuscript Title: Identity and skepticism-influential factors in modernization of healthcare systems in Hungary and Serbia	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0643/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/ <u>No</u>	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <u>Yes</u> /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
<i>Title of the manuscript is reasonably clear and it is strongly related to its contents</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	2
<i>The abstract contains an advancement on results. However, it neither makes reference to the objects of the research nor the overall methodology to be used</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	2
<i>Although the text is readable, it contains several spelling and grammatical mistakes which are required to be corrected. English proofreading is recommended</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>The methodology has been clearly presented and explained with a focus in the use of secondary sources. Both literature and secondary sources are shown</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clearly presented and sustained. Further, collected data could support further surveys which could lead to new results</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>Conclusions are, in general, accurate. However, they could be expanded to better round-up the results and discussions</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>References presented are comprehensive and appropriate to the object of the manuscript. However, there are references which have not been included on the text, and some of those mentioned on the text should be correctly presented (author/s, year)</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):

The manuscript provides interesting findings in the field. I recommend its publication after revisions indicated above. Abstract should contain a clear reference to methodology and objects. An English language final proofreading is recommended as there are grammatical and spelling mistakes.