

Paper: **“Investigating Bodily Injury”**

Submitted: 23 May 2022

Accepted: 27 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Corresponding Author: Endre Nyitrai

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p97](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n29p97)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Favio Farinella

National University of Mar del Plata, Argentina

Reviewer 2: Ferenc Dávid

University of Public Service, Hungary

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: See Comments

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

Yes, the title is adequate.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

I think the abstract doesn't include methods.

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

The article is grammatically correct.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes.

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

The paper is clear.

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

I suppose that the last 6 lines are the conclusion but It doesn't name.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Yes.

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]

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]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Dear Colleague,
Let me congratulate you. This paper is interesting and useful.

Reviewer L:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

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

I understand that the title of the article summarizes the central object of research.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract mentions a synthesis of the paper, even when it does not specify its quantitative limits (geographical, temporal and others) of the study. For example, the abstract does not specify where the mentioned Law belongs to. (eg. "Both in our country and worldwide" which is the country?). Just on page 4 it is mentioned that one of the laws belongs to Hungary.

The methodology followed by the article is not mentioned, nor are the results reached, which is necessary.

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

We find some grammatical errors and spelling mistakes that should be corrected before publishing the article in such a way that it does not obscure the relevance of the discussion raised.

Just to mention some of them, "depending on the fact whether" (lacking of) / "may also be committed by a way of negligence" (the "a" should not be there)/or "and grievous bodily injures" (instead of injury)/ "shall be taken into consideration at the classification" where it shall read "consideration in".

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The article presented will gain relevance if the methodology used in order to validate the proposed hypothesis is clarified and explained.

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

As we mentioned before, there are certain grammatical errors and spelling mistakes that must be corrected before publication.

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

Also in order to enhance the article, we suggest that it is necessary to include a section where the conclusions are discussed. At present, the article contains only a paragraph at the end where the conclusions are mentioned. It would be very convenient if it became independent and constituted a title within which the fundamental concepts expressed throughout the paper were discussed.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is basically complete. Perhaps it is possible to distinguish between the bibliography used and other elements found on the internet (webgraphy). Within the latter, it would be necessary not only to indicate the link where the publication is located, but also the name of the website and when was the last time it was accessed.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

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

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

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

2

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

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

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

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

1

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

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

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It would be very convenient to mention in the abstract the methodology to be used in the development of the article. Also the results you want to achieve.

Some grammatical errors need to be corrected. To this end there are tools on the internet to check them.

It is necessary and convenient to enhance the article to elaborate and deepen the conclusions.
